FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-129S
Wednesday
6 July 1988

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT

FBIS-SOV-88-129 *6 July 1988*

CONTENTS

19th CPSU CONFERENCE

30 June Aydak Conference Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 1
Further on Final Day Speeches, Activities 4
Mood of Conference Described 4
Moscow Gorkom's Mesyats Address *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 4
Melnikov Requests More Details 6
Melnikov Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 7
Morgun Speaks on Environment 10
Morgun Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 11
ZNAMYA Editor Baklanov 14
Baklanov Address Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 15
General Gromov Address 16
Gromov Address Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 17
Ukraine's Oleynik Speaks 19
Oleynik on AES 'Saturation' *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 21
Academician Primakov Address 22
Primakov Speech Published *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 23
Makhkamov on Local Potential *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* 26
News Conferences on Results of Meeting Reported 27
Kolbin on Ethnic Issues 27
Razumovskiy: Perestroyka Continues 28
Moscow's Karabasov Admits Corruption 28
Sagdeyev on Debates 29
Lukyanov: Lively Debate 29
Figurnov on Economic Reforms 29
Rules Out Unemployment 30
Armenian, Azerbaijani Delegates Comment *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 1 Jul]* 30
Scholar on Conference Spirit 31
Delegates Discuss Yeltsin, Ligachev Exchange 31
2 Jul News Conferences Continue To View Session 32
Razumovskiy, Lukyanov on Resolutions 32
Conference Results Discussed 35
Dobrynin Meets With Press 37
Medvedev Briefs Bloc Journalists 39
Conference Delegates Comment on Outcome 39
Doubts Assuaged 39
Kabaidze Comments *[NEDELYA No 26]* 40
Delegate Blames Ryzhkov for Plan Problems 41
Ministry Aides React to Kabaidze Speech *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jul]* 42
IZVESTIYA Editorial Hails Conference *[6 Jul]* 43
Public Reaction to Conference Reported 45
Western Reactions to Conference Deemed Premature
[Gerasimov in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 5 Jul] 45
Glazunov Views World Reaction 46
PRC View of Party Conference Observed 47
Bloc Countries' Greetings Messages Published 47
CPCZ Central Committee *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 47
SED, Honecker Message *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 48
Jaruzelski Conveys PZPR Greetings *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 48

Belorussia's Sokolov Interviewed on Conference *[Warsaw Television]* 49
Weekly Interviews Latvia's Pugo on Conference *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 27]* 49
Weekly 'Observers Roundtable' Discusses Reaction *[Pasko, Shishlin, Chukseyev]* 52
'Top Priority' Program Views Conference *[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]* 56
Estonian Economist Reviews Conference 60
Professor Advocates Rotation of Leaders 61
Conference Minutes To Be Published 61

30 June Aydak Conference Speech Published

PM0507090188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by A.P. Aydak, chairman of the "Leninskaya Iskra" Kolkhoz, Yadrinskiy Rayon, Chuvash ASSR, at 30 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Dear Comrades! Thanks to the expansion of democracy and glasnost, our society has learned that the country is in a critical situation. The system of leadership through administrative commands led to the point where for a long time we lived mainly at the expense of the peasant and his unpaid labor. And when peasants virtually disappeared in many parts of the country, oil appeared. The selling off of natural resources with a view to purchasing food abroad was a crime committed by the "heroes" of the time of stagnation against our history and our descendants. (Applause)

Some people believe that socialism is to blame for this. They do not know or do not want to know that what happened to our country from the late twenties was a distortion of socialism and its Leninist understanding. Others believe that the Communist Party is to blame. They do not take into account the fact that the bloody terror of the thirties and forties against the Leninists and other honest workers ruled out the possibility of the party's lower ranking structures influencing the state decisionmaking system.

We must return Leninist purity to our revolution, bearing strictly in mind that the Bolshevik leaders' sacrifice and personal modesty won them the highest prestige in our country. And we must ensure these qualities now. Here is what should be done primarily for this—it has already been said, and I am of the same opinion. Right now virtually all categories of citizens in our country have some privileges or other. As the speeches have already stated, we must put an end once and for all to talk about leaders' privileges. I think that they must be reduced to a single denominator: to wages dependent on the quantity and quality of labor. (Applause) And what is in the stores is there for everyone. This will be a reliable filter against the penetration of all kinds of timeservers into the party. There will probably no longer be a need for sociopolitical certification. (Applause)

We wholly support the proposal voiced in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report regarding the need to transfer to economic methods of leading the economy and their democratization. With regard to the countryside, this is expressed, in our view, in the real possibility of the free choice of the best equipment. For that, it is necessary to put an end to the monopoly position of giant plants producing equipment for the countryside. So much equipment is produced now, yet there is virtually nothing to choose from. It is necessary that not only state acceptance but also we consumers should force its quality to be ensured. Unless there is competition between plants for the sale of their equipment, I am sure we will not see good equipment. (Applause)

Next. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes should set their plans for themselves and if the country or a region lacks some output its production should be organized on a competitive basis through a state order on the most advantageous terms.

The system of management of the country's agro-industrial complex is also in need of democratization. At present democracy in this complex has still not risen above rayon level. At rayon level, we elect rayon agro-industrial associations, but we should elect associations up to union level. Perhaps the agro-industrial committee in its present form, as the report states and as we ourselves feel, will not last long. (Applause) But we should not laugh yet. (Applause) Whether it is good or bad at present, the transition to other forms of leadership should be resolved locally. What is good does not need to be implanted by force.

During the transition to the wholesale trade in equipment and the election of the leadership at all levels, the staff of the agro-industrial complex will inevitably be reduced. Here it is the normative method, as the Altay Kraykom first secretary said, which will be appropriate—to work out how many command personnel per unit of output are needed in the vertical hierarchy of the agro-industrial complex. As of this year, farms have already been deducting funds for the maintenance of the agro-industrial complex. But we are still deprived of the right of controlling their expenditure because the agro-industrial leadership above rayon level is not accountable to us, for there is no election of leaders.

Before I left for the party conference, the rayon party and economic aktiv expressed itself in favor of requesting that farms be released at least in part from the burden of debts for which they are not to blame. A great many manipulations have been carried out regarding agriculture, and for this reason, a great many debts have accumulated for which the kolkhozes are not to blame. The majority of the farms of our rayon are now in a difficult financial position, especially as equipment and fertilizers have become more expensive. It is difficult to manage a farm profitably, yet there are still no new purchase prices. In addition, farms have recently had to construct sociocultural and consumer establishments at their own expense, although expenditure on them is not included in prices for agricultural output, and they are sliding still further into debt. Yet in the cities, this construction is done at the expense of the budget. (Applause)

I am convinced that the upsurge of the countryside is the first and most important link for the successful progress of restructuring. As is well known, the transformations in China began with the countryside, and the improvement

of matters with regard to food enabled other reforms to be developed in their countries. Indeed, the New Economic Policy in our country began with the creation of conditions for boosting peasant farms. At the fourth congress of kolkhoz members, in whose work I took part, almost all the speakers stressed the social injustices about the countryside which still exist in our country: in the provision of fuel, sociocultural establishments, roads, or construction materials at any accessible price.

Right now, comrades, half the country's population is living in state apartments. The rent is insignificant. It compensates for only one-fourth of the state's actual expenditure on their maintenance, while three-fourths of the expenditure is covered by state grants and so forth at the expense of all society. Here, according to sociologists' calculations and from my own personal budget, I know that expenditure on maintaining private houses in the countryside is several times greater than expenditure on a state apartment, although the level of comfort in the former is incomparably lower. That is only on maintaining a house, without counting expenditure on its construction, for which as much as about R20,000 is required. The natural question arises among the people: Why, when he comes to the city, does yesterday's peasant receive a free apartment and municipal services when, if he remains in the countryside, he has to struggle for many years, doing without a great deal, to construct a house? This, in my opinion, is the main and most massive social injustice in our country. (Applause)

Without having made the urban and rural inhabitant equal in terms of social rights, we will not resolve the food problem because without that, the contract cannot realize the potential it contains. Counting on the contract is not justified unless we achieve social equality. Without compensation for part of the expenses connected with constructing and maintaining housing, on an equal footing with the city, you cannot halt the peasants' departure from the land. That means you cannot resolve the Food Program. That is the problem. (Applause)

The question arises: Where to take the funds for this? I think they can and must be found. In contrast to all the other speakers, I will also cite the sources. (Animation in the auditorium). For dozens of years, enormous funds have been spent and are now being spent on implementing imposing construction sites which later prove unnecessary or even harmful. And no one has taken responsibility for this. The ordinary worker pockets a handful of nails and is unfailingly made answerable, if only to the collective, and at any rate loses his bonus. But Kara-Bogaz-Gol? Who has been made answerable for the millions lost there? And for the harm caused to nature? For the approximately 1 million [unit not specified] of land recently written off by the Russian Government, land which had been considered drained or irrigated, about which we learned a week ago? In fact these lands have been put out of commission, although enormous capital investments were made in them. And for the work on the diversion of rivers which is in fact continuing despite the Politburo decision? Surely our ill-starred departments and their bosses, those latter-day princes, are not so omnipotent that there is indeed no justice against them? They divert enormous funds so necessary to the country, to the countryside, for the implementation of useless and often also harmful operations.

Substantial funds could also be obtained by improving the work of the extracting and processing industries, which largely work only for themselves, that is, they are eating themselves. An enormous reserve of ours is the use of secondary raw material. How much paper, old clothing, old shoes, glass, and so forth is wasted in the country because there is no effective system for collecting and using them. Yet these are ready-made resources. People from Cherepovets and Nizhniy Tagil have spoken here: There are factories smoking, superfluous factories, superfluous open-hearth furnaces are smoking. Yet these are ready-made resources!

The main reason for this situation is that there is no anti-expenditure mechanism operating in our industry. Yet many Western countries, as is well known, ensure almost half their requirements for many types of raw material by means of secondary raw material. (Applause) Our departments, it seems to me, are ready to destroy all of nature and to dig over all the land in the chase after gross output.

Funds will therefore be found, and I do not even mention staff reduction. But here I want to return to questions arising in connection with the writing off by the Russian Government 1 week ago of 1 million hectares of land which had been considered reclaimed. How was it possible that the land reclamation organizations plundered the state openly, before the eyes of the entire people? This government resolution stated that the lands had to be written off because of poor planning and construction. That's 1 million hectares! It is not simply a matter of a harvest that has not been obtained; it is also hundreds of millions of rubles of the people's money buried in the ground, money taken from the countryside, from our children. In the last 20 years, ever-increasing sums have been spent on land reclamation, mostly on water resources construction, but the country's food situation is not improving. Isn't this because there are no funds left for retooling agriculture? A legitimate question arises: Did party organizations really not know what was happening with land reclamation in the RSFSR? And why was no one interested in the exaggerated figures regarding its efficiency that were trumpeted by ministry leaders when they begged for more and more millions from the government, merely so they could bury them in the ground to no purpose?

Comrade Motornyy [Kherson Oblast kolkhoz chairman] has spoken here. So far as they are concerned, things are fine regarding land reclamation; so be it. Things aren't fine so far as we are concerned. In order to ensure that the conditions for such problems do not exist in the

future—and this is necessary under self-financing—it is advisable henceforth to cease the budget financing of land reclamation construction. This will be an obstacle to the cost-based principle of land reclamation. Henceforth, land reclamation work must be carried out only by contract with farms and using their money (Applause) in accordance with the internal farm land management scheme. I think the money allocated to the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources should be transferred to rayon organizations of the agro-industrial committee. They will determine unerringly where the funds should be used to ensure the best return—for the construction of roads, for social, cultural, and consumer services, or for land reclamation. The mobile mechanized columns and design organizations of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources must be transferred to contract work, without targeted financing of their activity.

Therefore, the funds will be found; you need only express the wish and tackle the matter. I think that they should be channeled primarily into boosting the non-Chernozem zone and constructing housing there. Equipment should be sold to peasants at preferential prices, and land should be leased to them where necessary. People who leave the city to live and work in rural areas must retain their city apartment. Given that condition, and also the resolution of other questions of social, cultural, and consumer services and highway construction, masses of people will return from the cities to the land of their forefathers, and this will decide the success of restructuring. This will also help to solve the zone's demographic problems because only the countryside provides expanded reproduction of the population. The reinstatement of the three-generation family will solve many education problems. (Applause)

Dear comrades, during the forties, with a view to ensuring the more rapid upsurge of the national outlying districts, comparable purchase prices for agricultural output were several times higher in Central Asia and the Transcaucasus than they were in the non-Chernozem zone. Hence remuneration also differed, of course. This fact, and also the development of heavy industry chiefly in the center of the country, led to a decline in the zone's agriculture. The center of the country, which withstood the intervention and stopped the fascist hordes, a region of guaranteed crop farming, found itself in an extremely grave situation. Justice requires—and we all, that is, all other peoples of the Land of the Soviets, have a vital interest in this—that the Russian people and their environment not lag behind other regions in their development. (Applause) I think more resolute measures should be taken for this.

At one time, because of language difficulties, the process of an exodus from Chuvash villages to the cities began considerably later than it did in Russian villages, although life in the countryside was extremely hard, as it was for the Russians. When I began work as chairman 24 years ago, a considerable proportion of our kolkhoz members had dispersed to Orenburg, Volgograd, Saratov, and Gorkiy oblasts in order to earn a livelihood, because yields were miserly—7-8 quintals per hectare—and the average milk yield per cow was less than 1,000 kg per year. In time, people came back. And this fact, and also the introduction of everything new and verging on the risky into production, made it possible to boost the farm's economy, although we tripled in size. The introduction of the antierosion farming system and the implementation of other environmental conservation measures have made it possible to obtain stable grain harvests of 34-35 quintals per hectare without using pesticides and herbicides for 9 years now and to create a good feed base. (Applause) I've nearly finished. Just another 3 minutes. (Laughter in the hall. Applause)

M.S. Gorbachev: Please go ahead.

A.P. Aydak: The milk yield now is over 4,500 kg. Our kolkhoz has been profitable since 1967. Last year we obtained a net profit of around R3 million, with a level of profitability of 49.7 percent. Of course, we are not increasing wages. We are making additional pension payments to veterans on behalf of the kolkhoz, making payments to mothers for children below school age, and giving free financial help to people who are building new houses.

Many problems have accumulated in our society. There were many losses. But nothing has been lost once and for all. It is a great boon that radical thinkers who set the task of restoring Leninist principles in the leadership of society and extricating the country from its economic impasse came to the leadership of the country 3 years ago. Good and truth are now triumphing in the country. And this truth will inevitably get through to all mankind. The communist convictions and patriotism of the considerable majority of our people are the guarantee that the Land of the Soviets will successfully solve its economic and social problems and play its historic role in preserving civilization from nuclear destruction and ecological disaster. (Applause)

The people are waiting for the conference's decisions. This is really the last chance. I want to draw conclusions from what I have said.

For restructuring to succeed, in my view, we need to solve three main problems. They must be solved before we leave this conference. First, we must ensure very high prestige for our Communist Party. For this purpose we must renounce privileges wherever these exist. Second, in order to resolve the food problem, we must ensure real equality for peasants, and not just pay lipservice to the idea. We must take into account the fact that we have been "fleecing" them for so many years. (Laughter) They must be given certain advantages so that the trade of peasant becomes most prestigious in our country. Third, in order to unleash initiative, we must destroy fear of the

possibility of a return of the cult and lawlessness. The most important point here is a limit of no more than two terms, with no exceptions. (Applause)

Further on Final Day Speeches, Activities

Mood of Conference Described

LD0107132688 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—TASS correspondents report from the Kremlin:

The 19th all-union party conference continues its work in the Kremlin in a democratic atmosphere of a frank and lively discussion on problems determining the fate of a further development of the USSR. This is felt in the way the delegates are discussing the report of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Delegates seek to express in their speeches their attitude to perestroyka which evokes today acute interests in the whole of Soviet society. The audience keenly reacts to each new original idea with applause, approving exclamations, remarks and questions. Sometimes it interrupts the speakers who repeat truisms or use the rostrum of the conference for reporting their accomplishments.

Not all those who expressed the desire to speak will be given an opportunity to address the conference from the high rostrum with the USSR national emblem on it. The time-table of the conference was approved at its first session. In order to enable as many delegates as possible to address the conference during the few days that it will be at work, it was decided yesterday to observe the 15 minute time limit set at the conference. Those whose speeches are too long are now warned of the need to stop by the ringing of a bell on the table of the chairman.

A short speech made at today's session by a worker delegate is indicative of the democratic atmosphere at the conference. He pointed out that some speakers continued to waste time of which the conference is so short. They repeat their own statements and speak about things of minor importance. "We are still not good enough at the upbringing of our leaders. In the future let us devote more attention to it", the worker said.

Heated discussions continue during the breaks. One can see in the spacious foyer groups of delegates engaged in a lively conversation or an argument. Many of them give interviews to newspaper and TV journalists covering the work of the conference. Their voice is heard every day by millions of people in the Soviet Union and outside it who follow the historic forum of the CPSU with unremitting attention.

Moscow Gorkom's Mesyats Address

PM0307140388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 6

[Speech by V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Delegates! I would like to begin my speech, and I think you will support me in this, by saying that the 19th all-union party conference is taking place in the spirit of the great responsibility for the fate of restructuring felt by all of us. During the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses and at delegate meetings, Communists have given their instructions to delegates. They are waiting for us to take them to the conference and see them reflected in its decisions. The main injunctions call for the party to not deviate from the adopted firm course aimed at restructuring for any reason, and that the line aimed at the acceleration of our society's socioeconomic development, broad democracy, glasnost, and the consistent implementation of radical economic reform should continue to be implemented with the same persistence and purposefulness. If we proceed from these fundamental injunctions, it is possible to boldly state that this conference will have justified the expectations of the entire party and the entire people. (Applause)

Comrades! Our delegation, which represents the half-million strong detachment of Moscow region Communists, has instructed me to voice full support for the report's provisions and conclusions. After the conference we will have things to take back with us to primary party organizations and labor collectives to convey the spirit of the conference to them, arm them with its ideas, and raise the people to resolve the tremendous tasks of deepening the processes of restructuring.

Under present-day conditions it has become absolutely clear that the task of increasing the efficiency of social production cannot be resolved without the introduction of scientific and technical progress, the galvanization of the human factor, the shaping of a new model of the socialist system of economic management, and in-depth interaction between state, cooperative, and private ownership. Today this is the most acute, I would say, the key question of restructuring in the sphere of the economy.

Our country's historical experience shows that social ownership cannot be identified with only one form of such ownership, state ownership. This error caused considerable damage during the period of Stalinism and stagnation. This is why we firmly support the course adopted by the party, aimed at developing the cooperative movement and the collective and lease contract, and transferring all sectors of the economy to economic accountability, self-financing, and cost recovery.

Today nobody needs to be persuaded of the advantages of these new forms of socialist economic management. The experience of creating cooperatives and introducing the lease contract under our oblast's conditions shows that these progressive forms of labor organization and incentive promote the accelerated development of social problems and the fuller satisfaction of working people's requirements for goods and services.

To back up this idea, allow me to cite a figure or two. Over 2,000 cooperatives of various kinds, joint-stock companies, associations, and consortiums have already been created in the Moscow region. This year they will produce goods and services to a value of more than R100 million, or five times as much as last year.

There are over 1,000 family collectives working on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and economically accountable lease contracts are being introduced. We are now convinced that the acceleration of this process requires the elaboration without delay of an economic and legal mechanism that would encourage people to actively develop the lease contract and convince them that this is not a short-term campaign, but rather a long-term party line aimed at fully realizing working people's right to be the real masters of the land.

A weighty contribution could be made to this by our economic scientists, who would, in addition to criticizing miscalculations and demonstrating the seriousness of the economic situation (we have heard about this at the conference), provide practical workers with a scientifically substantiated methodology for resolving the new economic and social tasks and, as the saying goes, get stuck into resolving them in practice with the entire people. This is precisely what we delegates were waiting for from the country's leading academics who have spoken here—esteemed Comrades Arbatov, Abalkin, and you too, Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk.

In the course of introducing new forms of socialist economic management, we often encounter camouflaged but powerful resistance in central economic and legal organs. This applies primarily to the USSR Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Justice, and the State Committee on Prices, along with their organs in the localities. They often obstruct the creation and development of nontraditional enterprises, seeing this as a direct encroachment on the foundations of the socialist mode of production.

Look at what happens. At the very height of the nationwide discussion of the Law on the Cooperative System we saw the introduction of a progressive tax on cooperative members' personal incomes, which made people distrust the course pursued by the party toward the democratization of the economy.

A new legislative enactment is now being prepared under which, in addition to the progressive tax on personal earnings, the tax on cooperatives will reach 30 percent of their gross income. If it is adopted we will be cutting off the cooperative movement at the roots. (Applause)

It is impossible not to mention bureaucracy and dogmatism, which are not as yet surrendering their positions. To have an enterprise running at a loss for decades is regarded as a normal socialist approach. If a nontraditional form for getting it out of its decline is found and people receive good wages as a result of highly productive labor, as Mikhail Sergeyevich has repeatedly said, this is regarded as deviating from socialism and flouting its principles.

In this connection I would like to recall the words spoken by Vladimir Ilich Lenin during the period of transition to the New Economic Policy: A person who achieves the greatest results does more good for the cause of socialist building than a person who thinks about the purity of communism but does not move things forward.

We support this kind of Leninist interpretation of the essence of socialist ideals. (Applause)

There is one other thought which I consider it necessary to express. Every working person and every labor collective must participate in the implementation of the Food Program. Yet there have been recent instances of enterprise and organization leaders rejecting patronage of the countryside outright. Their argument is that everyone ought to get on with his own job. We would agree with that, but it is clear to everyone that this is not yet a feasible task at this stage of restructuring. Many sovkhozes and kolkhozes are short of manpower. At the same time many labor-intensive processes in agriculture have not been fully mechanized. For example, our level of mechanization of vegetable farming is around 5 percent. Vegetable crops have to be harvested by hand, and potatoes, too. This year, for example, if the conditions turn out all right, we have to harvest nearly 1 million tons of vegetables and 1.4 million tons of potatoes, and obtain 2 million tons of milk. This is why we think patronage assistance to the countryside must not be slackened as yet, but must be built on an economic, contractual basis at a high-quality level. Possibly, a special USSR Council of Ministers resolution should be adopted on this question. (Applause)

Comrades, in the Central Committee report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the ensuing debate, the idea of restoring Leninist principles of the organization and activity of organs of soviet power was expressed. The problems that are being raised, problems of the separation of legislative and executive power; the formation of a deputies corps; the consolidation of standing commissions' powers; the delimitation of functions between party and soviet organs; the restoration of the Leninist idea of convening congresses of soviets; and the amendment of the structure and functions of the

USSR Supreme Soviet are indisputably important and topical. We wholly and fully support the proposal expressed in the report on this. Our delegation also supports the argument for the posts of soviet chairman and first secretary of the corresponding party committee to be held by the same person. As we understand it, the presidium would be the working organ of the soviet called upon to involve all deputies in active work and coordinate the activity of standing commissions, so that the soviet becomes a genuine organ of people's power. The ispolkom, on whose shoulders the entire weight of executive activity would fall, would be under the jurisdiction of the soviet, not the presidium. This question must be resolved.

Our time requires revolutionary action. Restructuring does not have time for years of experimentation because food, housing, and goods and services for the people are needed not in the distant future but today, right now. But we will only be able to solve these problems when soviets become not only fully sovereign but also highly authoritative on their territory. This will not happen immediately. Decades of their role being downgraded have undermined the people's trust in the soviets to a very great extent. It is no coincidence that everyone still goes to the party raykom, gorkom, or obkom for any reason. And we are firmly convinced that combining the posts of soviet chairman and first secretary of the corresponding party committee would serve as a powerful stimulus to increasing the soviets' role, intensifying their monitoring functions aimed at the unconditional fulfillment of adopted decisions, and providing the opportunity for soviet power to be reinforced with the authority and strength of party influence. (Applause)

One other question. We all well realize that the ideas of restructuring were advanced by the party. It was the party that bore the main burden of overcoming, with the people, the accretions of the past and difficulties, and of mastering new approaches. It is perfectly clear that without the vanguard role of the party the process of radical transformation will inevitably founder. We support the anxiety expressed by delegates regarding questions of party committees' incompetence being constantly and not always objectively raised in newspapers, journals, radio, and television, and the anxiety over the fact that the counterposing of party organs to local soviets and labor collectives is tolerated, and that calls for a purge of the party are appearing.

It is indisputable that the authority of party committees of various levels differs. It is also indisputable that many of them have not mastered methods of political leadership, are lagging behind in the restructuring processes, and do not always express the dominant mood in society. But all of us, Communists and nonparty people alike, are learning how to live and work under conditions of broadening democracy. We now need broad glasnost and objective, constructive criticism more than ever, not only to destroy what is obsolete but to create new things and consolidate all progressive forces for the sake and benefit of restructuring. In this connection, we think that the adoption of a press law determining the rights and responsibilities of the mass media for the objectivity and reliability of the items they carry would rectify many of today's deficiencies. (Applause)

Of course, it has been stressed very correctly and justly at the conference that recent outbursts of demagoguery have been making themselves felt and that all manner of troublemakers, loudmouths, and anarchist-type elements have been rearing their heads, attempting under the flag of democracy to sow mistrust in the party's course among people, and essentially denigrating restructuring. Voices can be heard talking about the party having run out of trust and the introduction of a multiparty system. Matters are further complicated by the fact that many party, soviet, and economic leaders, in fear of getting a reputations as enemies of restructuring, do not deal the requisite rebuff to all this "scum," avoid difficult discussions, and often display timidity, irresoluteness, and sometimes even complete ideological impotence. It is the task of the day to teach the party and economic aktiv to clearly distinguish democracy from demagoguery and declare uncompromising war on the latter. (Applause)

Comrades, a genuinely socialist society matching Lenin's vision, an economically and politically recovered society, is being born before our very eyes and with our participation. We Moscow region Communists, aware of our supreme responsibility to the party for restructuring, are fully determined to continue to follow the path charted in April 1985 and by the 27th CPSU Congress. (Applause)

Melnikov Requests More Details

LD0107130388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by Melnikov, adjuster at the "50-Letiye SSSR" Volzhskiy Motor Vehicle Works, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] The success of perestroyka will, to a decisive extent, depend on how actively and fully ordinary toilers, workers, and peasants participate in the processes taking place in society. If only the apparat either at the top or at the bottom engage in perestroyka, nothing will come of it. After all, the present conference is a nationwide one and it is necessary to take into account the views of the grassroots levels of the labor collective. This view is expressed in the mandates given to us delegates.

Today I would like to speak about the soviets of labor collectives as a form of self-management in labor collectives, a subject which was dealt with in the report. First of all, by setting up the soviets, the distance from the worker who is a passenger and a spectator, to the worker who is in command is covered much more quickly, particularly if workers are chairmen and members of the

soviets. No, far be it from me to suggest that only workers should run the soviets and that the work formulas should be identical everywhere. Let the labor collectives themselves resolve these questions. I am in favor of there being more variety in the work of the soviets of labor collectives. This can only be beneficial. It is a matter here of the considerably increasing level of responsibility, not only for one's own affairs but for the affairs of the collective. And the fears of some trade union leaders to the effect that by setting up the soviet of the labor collective, the trade union will have nothing to do and perhaps that this will be the end of trade unions, are wrong.

Practice has shown that there is enough work for both. The trade union and the labor collective council have to cooperate now as a public legislative body. It would be altogether incorrect to say that there are no problems in the labor collective councils.

We have recently been talking and writing about the braking mechanism, which is active in the economy, and in the democratization of our society, and which does not make it possible for the Law on the State Enterprise to fully function. In places, this law is not at all observed when the independence of the enterprise is at issue. What kind of self-management can there be here if the collective itself is unable to decide how to sell production, especially above plan output, and is doing this on instruction from above! One also encounters the following paradox: A collective has money at its disposal and is unable to find a use for it. I wish to say now that if we are talking about the independence of an enterprise, then it has to be complete and not half an effort. On the whole nowadays there should not be any half-hearted decisions and views of rights given by the law.

I will support the proposal for a maximum of glasnost—as was already said here—both in the work of the CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo. We wish to know in greater depth the position of each Central Committee and Politburo member on this or that question, excluding, of course, those which represent a state secret. The ignorance of the essence of matter generates absurd conjectures printed in several typefaces which are passed around from hand to hand and which arouse public opinion, as happened with Comrade Yeltsin. We wish to know this not just for the sake of idle curiosity but so that during the elections to the Central Committee and the Politburo, preference is given to those comrades whose views reflect the opinions of the majority of Communists and of all working people.

While you were in Tolyatti, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you gave us an order to become trendsetters in world motor vehicle building. It is very difficult to resolve this task inasmuch as our suppliers—and there are some 400 of them—are seriously lagging behind in mastering the most up-to-date output for VAZ, which is up to world standards. VAZ itself is ready for this. After all, we should already be ahead today, if only with a lead of at least one car length in the world market. This task must be tackled at state level.

Comrades, even here in Moscow I feel the eyes of the 20,000 strong VAZ collective on me, and not only its eyes. There in the workshops and workers' collectives, answers are awaited to many sore questions which were raised by them.

I hope that the decisions and resolutions passed by the conference will justify their hopes.

And I would like, and it is necessary, that after the conference a nationwide referendum should be held on the usefulness of this conference.

Melnikov Speech Published

PM0407113188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 6

[Speech by A.A. Melnikov, fitter at the mechanical assembly chassis production shop of Kuybyshev Oblast's "50-Letiya SSSR" Volga Motor Vehicles Plant, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! The success of restructuring will depend to a decisive extent on how actively and fully the ordinary working people—workers and peasants—are involved in the processes taking place in society. If restructuring is tackled only by the apparatus, be it from above or below, nothing will come of it. After all, this conference is a conference of the whole people and the opinions of grass root links, of labor collectives, must be taken into account. This opinion is expressed in the instructions given to us delegates.

Today I would like to speak about labor collective councils as a form of self-management within labor collectives, a topic that was mentioned in the report. The leaders of the party, government, and AUCCTU were right to back this form of working people's participation in the management of production and in the solution of many social and national economic tasks. This year will see the 10th anniversary of the day when the first shop labor collective councils started functioning in our plant with team councils as a base. Above all else, the creation of councils helps to cover—far more quickly—the distance between workers who are parasites and onlookers and those who are proper stewards, especially when workers are chairmen and members of the councils.

No, I am hardly suggesting that councils throughout the country be run only by workers and that the forms of work be the same everywhere. Let the labor collectives themselves decide all these questions. What I advocate is that the work of labor collective councils should contain more variety, which can only be beneficial. This entails a substantial increase in the level of responsibility, not

only for one's own affairs but also for the collective's affairs. It is responsibility and effective rights that will allow workers to extricate themselves from the quagmire of indifference and reach the firm ground of independence and initiative. Some trade union leaders fear in vain that the creation of labor collective councils would leave nothing for trade unions to do and might even signify their end. Practice has shown that there is more than enough work for both of them. The report was precise on what the trade unions must do. The only point now is that the trade union aktiv and apparatus must show greater competence, responsibility, and commitment to principle. Unfortunately, all these are in short supply at times.

At this point, trade unions and labor collective councils must collaborate as social and legislative bodies. However, it would be wrong to say that there are neither problems nor difficulties in the activity of labor collective councils. Recently we have been talking and writing about the braking mechanism at work in the economy and in our society's democratization. It prevents the Law on the State Enterprise from being fully effective, while in places this law is not implemented at all if we are talking about the independence of enterprises.

How can we talk about self-management if the collective cannot decide for itself how to market its output, especially output above plan, and is doing everything according to orders from above? Another paradox arises when a collective has money but cannot use it for anything.

Now I would like to say that, if we are going to talk about the independence of enterprises, it must be full rather than semi-independence. Generally speaking, there must be no semi-decisions, opinions, or legal provisions.

I believe that our conference will play its part to a considerable extent if we manage to discover the reasons why this mechanism developed and find ways to neutralize its destructive effect. Unfortunately, the braking, and at times stifling, mechanism has not bypassed even new structures, such as the labor collective council. I believe that the path to the future lies in self-management. Let me give a few examples. A conflict developed in our plant last year between the labor collective council and the leadership of the general director's office, the party committee, and the trade union committee. Strictly speaking, I find nothing frightening in a conflict as such. A new body is asserting itself, many ideas and habits are being demolished, and it would be downright suspicious if everything were proceeding quietly and smoothly. Thus, some leaders found the plant council a little too independent and unmanageable; some rather controversial questions were raised at its sessions, including the supply of meat and dairy products, which apparently excites people, and so on. Therefore, there was a proposal to reduce the council by two-thirds; in other words, to set up a "pocket" council. It consisted of 90 members, and they wanted to cut it to 30. Yet our collective at the Volga Motor Vehicles Plant consists of 120,000 members. Arguments were put forward in favor of a 30-person council. However, the workers, council chairmen, and production departments did not accept this formula. They literally stood up to defend the council and upheld its composition. This in itself was an important fact. Something like this would have been simply impossible before April 1985. Can you, comrade delegates, imagine our shock when we read the following, 3 months later, in a recommendation from the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the AUCCTU, approved by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo: "The council's numerical strength must not exceed 30 members."

How do such documents come into being? What logic guided the authors of the recommendation to determine the numerical strength of the council—the logic of ceilings or the logic of democratization? Could it be that the leaders of central bodies have yet to realize that any documents from above, even if just recommendations, are perceived at local level as more than orders, especially by those whom it suits to do so? Sometimes, perhaps, we should adhere to the principle: The best recommendation is no recommendation at all. (Applause) That is why I support the proposal regarding maximum glasnost, as has already been said here, and in the work of our central bodies, the CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo.

We want to know in greater detail the stance taken by every Central Committee and Politburo member on various questions, except those, obviously, that concern state secrets. Ignorance of what is involved gives rise to wild speculation, reproduced in numerous typewritten versions that circulate by hand and excite public opinion, as happened in the case of Comrade Yeltsin. We do not want to know this for the sake of idle curiosity, but so that, during elections to the Central Committee and the Politburo, we can give our vote to those comrades whose views reflect the opinion of the majority of Communists and working people.

Another example: Article 7 of the Law on the State Enterprise reads in part: "...the members of labor collective councils perform their duties on a voluntary basis [na obshchestvennykh nachalakh]." The recommendations mentioned above amplify matters: The councils should have a chairman, a deputy chairman, and a secretary. It all seems correct, the apparatus is being cut back at every level, and yet for some reason or other an apparatus is taking shape within labor collectives. You must realize that this is up to us, up to the labor collective. We are on economic accountability and we will not support the idle. We, and we alone will decide whether council members work fully or partially on a voluntary basis, or whether they will be full-time officials. Hence, I ask our legislators to examine this question during the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and to repeal the voluntary basis provision in Article 7. After all, there is a great deal of work to be done in the councils and, to cope with it, some people might have to

become "snowdrops" [administrative officials employed in the guise of ordinary workers], and this bodes nothing good. Why should we deceive ourselves? And I am not just asking that on behalf of labor collective councils. What I said applies equally to elected party, trade union, and Komsomol officials and to deputies, as well. The instructions given to me were specific: Give us an opportunity to determine how many such officials will be released from work duties, how they will work, and what sort of wage fund will be set up for them. Such a solution will only benefit democracy in production.

What is it that alarms me? We are again seeing a gap between words and deeds, as in the recent past. How many beautiful words beginning with "self-" have been spoken from the highest rostrums: self-reliance, self-financing, self-recoupment, self-management, but when it comes down to documents there is very little of all this "self-" left. Therefore, if a Central Control Commission subordinate to the party congress alone were to be revived, as under Lenin—and this is a proposal I support—it should, in my view, primarily deal with ensuring that our leaders' actions match their words.

I would like to see more workers and peasants elected to this organ—approximately 50 percent—and the percentage of workers and peasants should be greater in elections to conferences and congresses. For example, we have managed to elect almost all the ministers to our conference. But who has prevented them from restructuring over the last few decades? After all, the levers of the management of restructuring are mainly in their hands, while workers often have to do it through debate to the extent they can.

I support the view—if indeed such a time is to come—that the ministries should be abolished and, even better, that directors' councils should be set up in their place, with the involvement of labor collective councils. (Applause) It is also important to give very thorough preparation to the new documents and laws.

Recently we studied the draft Law on Trade Unions, which came to the plant for preliminary discussion. Here is something that immediately put us on our guard—the attempts to erode the powers and responsibilities of labor collective councils.

For example, Article 7 of the Law on the State Enterprise says that decisions on the utilization of funds for material incentives, social development, and so on are made by the labor collective council. But the draft Law on Trade Unions proposes that estimates for expenditures from those funds be approved by a joint decision of the administration, the council, and the trade union. Who knows what the idea behind that is.

We must be careful with the word "joint;" we must consult the people more, and we must think about demarcating the functions of all our bodies while simultaneously boosting the responsibility of each one for various specific tasks.

That is why I was put on guard by the report's proposal that party committee first secretaries be elected chairmen of soviet presidiums. Would it not be better to abolish party committee departments like production management, trade, and others of which we have too many, and consolidate instead the ideological sector where we are rather weak at present? But we are still striving to establish direct control over the soviets' activity.

I believe that there are sufficient forms of party influence on the activity of the soviets, and if we want to try to introduce a new form, this should be done only in individual cases. In order to enhance the role of the soviets in the solution of all national economic tasks, we must find forms of work whereby the solution of topical problems is the province of not just the leaders or management apparatus of soviets but of all people's deputies. This will boost, as it were, the status of people's deputies.

Comrade Delegates! The Central Committee Theses for the 19th party conference say that the correct determination of relations between local soviets and labor collective councils is of special importance. This is indeed a topical question. As a matter of fact, the shoots of such collaboration already exist. Many labor collective council members are also deputies of local bodies of authority. Leaders of local organs are always welcome guests at labor collective council sessions. They eagerly take advantage of this opportunity. But this is probably not enough. We would probably have to take the path of organizing regular congresses of labor collective council representatives at all levels, including union level. Moreover, these congresses must be constitutionally recognized in due course and must be given certain powers, including the right to exercise legislative initiative.

But everything must be well thought out here. That is why I ask the leaders of the party and the government, the Supreme Soviet, the trade unions, and the Komsomol not to file this at the back of some drawer but to convene an all-union conference of labor collective council representatives before the end of this year.

We have plenty to talk about. This fresh force, born out of the process of restructuring, must be more actively involved in everything. The forum should examine the question of whether labor collective councils should have their own press organ.

I would like to see, here at the conference, a meeting between labor collective council chairmen and one of the Politburo members. We must not only follow the path of directly subordinating labor collective councils to local soviets, nor should we just make the labor collective councils the executive committees of trade unions. Such proposals have already been aired in the press. Let the labor collective council be subordinate to the labor collective alone.

We were pleased for Comrade Travkin and his economic council, learning more and more about it from the press and television. Then we became cautious, on hearing Nikolay Ilich assert categorically that only the top economic leader should be chairman of the council. We tried again to gain access to newspapers and television to describe the approach at the Volga Motor Vehicles Plant, but the result was virtually zero.

Please don't misunderstand me: I am not saying this because I am a worker and happen to be a council chairman. This is also the stance of economic, party, and trade union leaders, for it is more democratic if ordinary workers are at the head of the council.

Comrades, the delegates to our conference were elected exactly as the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum prescribed. There have been no violations here. But the actual procedure for the nomination and election of candidates left people with an unpleasant taste, and everyone told me this prior to my departure for Moscow. It must be admitted that we hoped this campaign would introduce more elements of democracy, but we were disappointed when we learned that everything was again being done according to quotas set from above. What we would like is for this approach not to be repeated during preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress. Delegates must be nominated and discussed by primary party organizations. For this purpose, party leaders must also be made accountable to primary party organizations.

Another cause of worry is the fact that few actual workers are now at the head of party committees. And yet a worker is the one who has better knowledge of working people's needs and is closer to them. Even party members are now admitted according to plan, according to quotas, as if we were pressing parts on an automatic production line.

I would like to support the proposal that 10 percent or even more of party membership dues should be left at the disposal of primary party organizations. What I want to say is that, before starting the democratization of society, we must start democratizing the party. There are very many unsolved problems here.

It is clear from our instructions that questions of building housing and social, cultural, and consumer services facilities still remain unresolved. The USSR Council of Ministers targeted Resolution No 1002 on these matters, adopted in October 1985, as not being properly implemented.

The ecological situation is a sore spot, and this is reflected in all the instructions from labor collectives. We would not like to see Mother Volga, Russia's main thoroughfare, turn into a dead river, and for this purpose enterprises must be constructed with a completely closed production cycle. If today we do not struggle for a clean environment as actively as we are struggling against nuclear and chemical weapons and war in general, we could end up suffocating ourselves before such a calamity befalls us.

One final point. When you visited Tolyatti, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you gave us instructions: to become trendsetters in the world motor vehicle industry. This task is very difficult to accomplish, because our supplier partners—and there are about 400 of them—are seriously behind in assimilating the latest products for the Volga Works in line with world standards. The plant itself is ready and waiting. By today we should have already been ahead of at least one-third of the carmakers on the world market. This task must be resolved on a statewide scale.

Comrades, even here in Moscow I feel that the eyes, and not just the eyes, of the 120,000 members of the Volga Works collective are upon me. People there, in the shops and labor collectives, await an answer to the many pressing questions they face. I hope the decisions and resolutions adopted by the conference will justify their hopes. I would like to see—and I think it's necessary—a nationwide referendum after the conference on the benefits it has brought. (Applause)

Morgun Speaks on Environment

LD0107114888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Speech by F.T. Morgun, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] The problems of ecology are now of a broad social and economic nature. They are being constantly reflected in the programs of political parties and governments and are an area of special attention for the world public and mass media. Nor have they bypassed our country, a matter which was referred to with some alarm by Mikhail Sergeyevich in his report and by a great many delegates in a principled and rightly sharp manner.

A lowering in the natural fertility of the land and a reduction of humus in the soil is being noted; the forests are in an unsatisfactory state. Sixty-four million tonnes of harmful substances are being released into the atmosphere by industry and even more by motor vehicles. Their content in the air from all the industrial centers exceeds the sanitory norms. In 102 towns with a total population of 50 million people, the concentration is quite often more than 10 times above the permitted norms. The quality of water is deteriorating almost everywhere, especially in the rivers Ob and Irtysh of western Siberia, where pollution by petroleum products is 20 times above the permitted norm. The waters of the Volga, Dnepr, Don, the Ural, Kura, Amur, Syr-Darya, the Amu-Darya, and many other rivers are rapidly

deteriorating. If the most decisive measures are not taken immediately, then in certain basin regions of these rivers, the water will soon be unsuitable for drinking and irrigation.

The seas are becoming polluted. The concentration of carbolic acid in the Caspian Sea is nine times above the permitted norm and four times above the norm in the Baltic Sea. The Aral is a zone of ecological disaster. The living conditions and everyday activities of almost 1 million inhabitants in Karakalpakia and a number of oblasts in Kazakhstan and Turkmenia have become extremely complicated. The main polluters of the air, the soil and the waters are the enterprises of the Ministry of Power and Electrification, the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production, the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of the Petroleum Industry, the State Committee for the Agro-Industrial Complex, and others. A particular blow is being inflicted on nature today by ill-considered chemicalization. Comrade chemical workers! Put a brake on your present expansion! Take time off and let people breathe normal air, and let the rivers and the soil cleanse themselves of all the rubbish! [applause]

During this brief halt, put the existing plants on these rivers and soils in order—and this is the main thing—propose ecologically pure and economically beneficial waste-free projects and your requests for the construction of new factories will willingly be accepted in Ufa, Volgograd, Dzhambul, Kirishi, Cherkassy, Grodno, even in Kremenchug, and everywhere where factories are being waved away today like persistent flies. It is not individual—as you often claim—uneducated dilettants who are rejecting this; it is the people who are hitting back everywhere. And the people are not fools. Mankind has no chance of salvation if protection of the environment and its accessibility do not become a major element determining the whole of our development.

In the sphere of ecology and restructuring it is also not just necessary, it is inevitable. Here it is also behind in its work. Our main economic problems did not arise because we did not have enough works and factories; on the countrary it is because we have too many of them, and not the ones we should have according to trends and technology. There is no need to start building hundreds of new factories, but we must get down to modernization in order to fulfill the task which we have laid down at the congress—to build up gross industrial output. But remember at the same time that priority must be given to questions of rendering assistance to the countryside, about which practically every delegate here has been speaking so passionately. [applause]

If we do not solve the food program in the next few years we shall lose the people's confidence. The countryside is the savior of ecology and the countryside must be helped in all respects! The two will gain and everyone will gain! [applause] Permit me to report to the conference delegates that the committee understands its role as being not one of contraposition—ecology versus economy. We must approach these problems from positions of common state interests which exclude both support for regionalism and departmental egoism. We cannot fail to take into consideration the fact that the majority of managers today have taken over enterprises and departments as they are, and they are not to blame for past mistakes. But if they—today's managers—realize in their hearts and minds the need for the speediest and radical solution to ecological problems, work honestly in this direction, vigorously put purification buildings into operation, and transfer production on to waste-free lines, we will be able to help them actively and protect them from all the babblers. Those involved in the environmental protection bodies will show no mercy to those who show passivity, neglect, and irresponsibility to the environment and its resources.

Morgun Speech Published

PM0407164088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 6-7

[Speech by F.T. Morgun, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Nature Conservation, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! Each of us has had moments in his life that have abruptly changed his personal plans and his destiny. Soviet people are linking the destiny of the homeland with and pinning their own hopes on the present conference. Therein lie its exceptional significance and the special responsibility of each of the delegates. The people have given a mandate: Uphold and resolutely implement the platform to save the country elaborated by the Central Committee April (1985) plenum and creatively developed by subsequent plenums and the 27th party congress. In line with this mandate, the report by General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the delegates' debate were permeated with the spirit of creative renewal. I want to dwell on ecological problems. Modern science and technology have given people the means to influence nature, making it possible to encroach upon it and often, with unforeseen consequences, disrupt and destroy the mechanisms that keep natural processes in balance. It is for these reasons that the severe problem of acid rain has appeared in regions of Europe, Asia, and North America and there are global climatic changes.

Ecology problems are now of a broad social and economic nature, they are reflected in the programs of political parties and governments, and are a sphere of special interest for the world public and the media. Nor have they passed our country by, as was discussed with concern by Mikhail Sergeyevich in the report and in a principled, correct, and telling manner by very many delegates. There is a reduction in the natural fertility of the land, there is a reduction in humus in the soil, and forests are in an unsatisfactory state. Some 64 million

tonnes of harmful substances are discharged into the atmosphere by industry and even more by automobiles, and the content of these substances in the air exceeds health norms in all industrial centers. In 102 cities with a total population of 50 million, concentrations are frequently 10 times the permitted level and more.

Last year the national economy used 400 cubic kilometers of water, not including irrigation, I must emphasize. This is nearly twice the amount that flows through the Volga in a year or eight times the amount that flows through the Dnepr. Water quality is deteriorating nearly everywhere, but particularly in the rivers of West Siberia, the Ob and the Irtysh, where the concentration of petroleum products is 20 times greater than the permitted level. Water in the Volga, Dnepr, Don, Ural, Kura, Amur, Syr-Darya, Amu-Darya, and many other rivers has sharply deteriorated. Unless the most resolute measures are taken immediately, water in some parts of the basins of these rivers will very soon be unfit to drink and use for irrigation purposes. Seas are becoming polluted; the concentration of phenol in the Caspian is 9 times greater than the permitted level and in the Baltic 4 times greater. The Aral Sea is an ecological disaster area. The conditions in which nearly 1 million people in Karakalpakia and a number of oblasts of Kazakhstan and Turkmenia live and go about their business have become extremely bad, as Central Committee Secretary Comrade Nishanov and Health Minister Comrade Chazov have sorrowfully testified at the conference. The poor quality of the water in our rivers, lakes, and seas is a sign from nature that the biological processes to maintain the purity of the water are subject to the destructive impact of industrial and municipal effluent and ill-considered chemicalization. It has become considerably more difficult and considerably more expensive for the inhabitants of big cities to obtain pure water, breathe fresh air, and enjoy greenery and quiet than to acquire food and clothing. The chief polluters of air, soil, and water are enterprises of the Ministry of Power and Electrification, the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production, the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of the Petroleum Industry, Gosagroprom, and others.

Leningrad scientists at the Institute of Limnology recently sent a study to the committee. According to their figures, in the non-Chernozem zone 60 percent of animal fertilizers pass into the water. Some 53 million tonnes of organic fertilizers were not utilized there in 1965, 94 million in 1975, and 112 million in 1985. I have cited the example of the non-Chernozem zone because I have obtained some new facts. In most of the other zones, aside from Belorussia, the Baltic republics, and Kiev, Cherkassy, and some other oblasts, the situation is just as bad as in the non-Chernozem zone. In the country as a whole, figures for organic fertilizer losses are astronomical. For years, manure has been piling up around livestock units, poisoning ponds, lakes, and rivers. It is not so much kolkhozes' and sovkhozes' responsibility as their calamity.

Hardly any materials and facilities have been allocated for the construction of manure storage, and most farms lack equipment to move organic fertilizers promptly to the fields and spread them.

Instead of first of all supplying the countryside with everything it needs to organize storage and movement of organic fertilizer, the country continues to pursue a policy of increasing mineral fertilizer production capacities. And this is taking up a vast quantity of funds and materials.

Ill-considered chemicalization is a particular blow to nature today. Comrade chemical workers, put a brake on your current expansion, take a break, let people breathe normal air, clear all the rubbish (applause) out of the rivers and the soil and, during this temporary halt, put existing production in order, and, most important of all, propose ecologically clean and economically advantageous, waste-free projects, and then your requests for the construction of new plants will be welcomed in Ufa, Volgograd, and Dzhambul, in Kirishi, Cherkassy, Grodno, Kremenchug, and all the places where at the moment new plants are being brushed away like pesky flies. In fact, they are not being rejected by the odd ill-educated dilettante, as you claim, they are being repulsed everywhere by the people, and you can't deny the people's wisdom. And don't talk about decisions adopted in the past. Even the ancients knew that it is a bad law or decision that cannot be revoked or changed. Indeed, no reasonable person would oppose mineral fertilizer production in principle. But if the rapid growth of the volume of resources going into this sector is combined with a chronic lag in other, no less important types of activity, it is time to think about the reasons for and consequences of the way these resources are distributed. A century ago, Dokuchayev, the top soil scientist, noted that in the central Chernozem oblasts of Russia and in the Ukraine, black earth was 10-12-14 percent humus. Now we have plowed the riches out and only 3-4 percent remains.

I am frightened of violating the standing orders, so I cannot give the conference delegates a detailed account of the struggle 15 years ago in Poltava Oblast for soil cultivation without plows. But I will say that in the past 8 years, practically all arable land in the oblast has been cultivated without using plows, and Poltava farms have cleaner fields than oblasts where they use plows. The Poltava farmers now have the biggest yields in the left-bank Ukraine and the cheapest grain, feed, and livestock products in the republic. More than 3 million extra tonnes of grain and more than R500 million in extra income have been obtained.

But the main result of cultivation without plows is soil protection. Moldboard plows and deep plowing are the main causes of the loss of humus and erosion of the soil. In our country, particularly in the steppes and forest steppes, wherever plows plow up the soil and leave it exposed to meltwater and rainwater for washing and to

wind and heat for drying, they are immediately followed by water and wind erosion, robbing the land of its fertile layer, and, as a result, we are forced to produce more and more mineral fertilizers and equipment to compensate for the loss of fertility. The plow ruins and destroys, yet we make 200,000 of them every year. We find the metal and the money for this calamity for our soil, but there is no high-quality metal for subsurface tillers, subsoilers, slotters, and wide-span cultivators; there is no metal for equipment to handle manure properly, nor is there, unfortunately, metal for the production of modern drills and facilities for high-quality spreading of mineral fertilizers. (Applause)

So we are not applying the fertilizers properly, but are throwing them around, or, rather, throwing them away. But in nature nothing is lost. They are carried by streams into reservoirs and then show up as blue-green algae and all manner of impurities that destroy all living things in the Volga, Dnepr, Don, and other rivers.

In our crucial and ecologically disturbing time it is very dangerous to adopt a wait-and-see attitude, as many people are still doing. Mankind has no chance of salvation unless the protection of the environment and its accessibility are a very important element determining our entire development.

In the ecology sphere, restructuring is not just essential, it is unavoidable. And it has been late coming. Why is the ecological situation so bad? The ill-considered desire, throughout the 5-year plans, to construct giant enterprises has led in many regions to an overconcentration of multisector science and excessive stress on the environment.

Industrialization did not take into account the proper ecological demands and often this position was irresponsibly ignored. Even in recent years, when it should be clear what lies in store for us, people have not been seriously concerned about nature conservation technology, too few resources have been allocated for this purpose, and those that have been allocated have not been assimilated. Plants are emitting smoke and fumes; they are pouring dirty water into clean rivers; people are being deafened by noise, while the directors and their lofty patrons, who have never learned to see and think beyond their narrow departmental interests, boast about more and more bigger capacities.

Our main economic problems are due not to the fact that we have few plants and factories, but to the fact that there are too many, and the wrong ones, in terms of type and technology. We must not press for the construction of new plants, we must modernize in order to implement the task we set at the congress—increase gross industrial output. (Applause) But remember also that assistance to the countryside, about which nearly every delegate has spoken so movingly here, takes precedence over everything else. (Applause) If we do not solve the food problem we will lose the people's trust. The countryside is also ecology's salvation. The countryside must be helped in every respect. The city will benefit, everyone will benefit. (Applause)

Ecological problems do not arise spontaneously. They are the consequence of our technological and ecological incompetence, bad management, and irresponsibility. Things have gone too far. It is time to put a stop to the unintelligible gabble about the consequences of anthropogenic activity, the activity of abstract people. Those behind every outrage against nature and instance of damage to people's health are specific academicians and scientists, planning institutes and construction workers, and members of state commissions, with whose blessing facilities that destroy the environment are commissioned. And, finally, those who work at these enterprises: from director to worker. Those who planned seas on the Dnepr and the Volga and promised greater benefits but in fact caused problems must be named and receive their just deserts. One might say that for a whole era our party and professional propaganda and science have been intolerably passive as far as ecology is concerned. For many decades the environment has been undergoing catastrophic pollution, forests have been disappearing, and minerals have been mined without a care.

Instead of forestalling and taking sensible steps to inhibit this reckless extravagance and sounding the alarm, they sang odes to the conquerors of nature. An entire generation of people grew up not knowing that by destroying nature they were planting a time-bomb under themselves. It was only after the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum, as a result of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost and on the intitiative of the party and Government leadership, that a nationwide struggle began for the environment, a struggle for real scientific and technological progress and against false optimism.

CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's well-considered and honest words to the effect that ecological issues have now taken their place, as far as mankind is concerned, alongside questions of defending peace and preventing a nuclear war are sobering.

In January the CPSU Central Committee and Government adopted a resolution on fundamentally restructuring nature conservation activity. In view of the proposals elaborated with the active participation of central and local bodies, leading scientists, and specialists and the opinion of broad public circles, a range of measures has been outlined to improve the ecological situation.

Judging by the enormous flood of letters, telegrams, telephone calls, and requests, we, the State Committee on Nature, are expected to emerge from the formation stage carrying a big stick, to close plants and factories right, left, and center, and call leaders to account.

Permit me to report to the conference delegates that the committee sees its role not in terms of counterposing ecology to the economy. We must approach these problems on the basis of statewide interests, which preclude support for both local and departmental egoism. We have to consider the fact that most of the present leaders took over enterprises and departments as they are now and they are not to blame for past errors. But if they, today's leaders, realize in their hearts and minds the need for the immediate, radical solution of ecological problems and work honestly in that direction, vigorously commission antipollution installations, and switch to waste-free production, we will actively help them and protect them from any shrill critics. Personnel of nature conservation organs will be ruthless toward those who are passive, negligent and irresponsible as far as nature conservation and natural resources are concerned.

We will also be steadfast in cases where someone, by force of inertia, proposes solutions that repeat past mistakes. All the work of nature conservation bodies will be carried out in close cooperation with academic, sector, and VUZ scientific organizations, with local soviets, and with Gosplan and the ministries.

Close collaboration with the public movement for environmental conservation will be an essential condition of the State Committee's successful work. In the spirit of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost, we will publicize the situation, expose bad management and irresponsibility, and help the press, radio, and television to widely propagandize good examples of the struggle for nature and name all those who are polluting the environment.

Excuse me, Comrade Delegates, for talking mainly about negative things; there are, and this is a very good thing, many splendid examples. But good things speak for themselves and it is the unpleasant factors from which we must draw conclusions. And I am asking you all, Comrade Delegates, particularly leaders of party and soviet bodies in the republics, oblasts, and krays.

The process of forming nature conservation committees is currently taking place in republics and krays; be so good as to help select intelligent, honest, responsible people for the committees so that you can rely on them, and they will give honest assistance where assistance is needed and take the most serious and principled steps to put things right where the environment is in bad shape.

One final observation. Writers in the press and some delegates have reproached those who proposed the resolution on the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism. You are wrong, Comrades! The Politburo has to be thanked for this honest and, if you like, courageous document. We know what part of the budget depends on vodka. Vodka is like a trojan horse in the cash plans. So I repeat, this honest and courageous document deserves the people's deep respect. So we who were unable to put it into practice, who were guilty of inefficiency and negligence, we must bear the responsibility and work hard for real sobriety. (Applause)

ZNAMYA Editor Baklanov

LD0107165188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Delegate Baklanov, chief editor of the ZNAMYA magazine and secretary of the board of the USSR Writers' Union, took part in the debate. What lofty ideas inspired the discussion of the report in the speeches by the metallurgy workers and Comrade Aydak, chairman of a Kolkhoz in Chuvash ASSR, and that by Fedor Trofimovich Morgun that has just been heard! And how narrow-minded, resentful, and limited to their personal problems sounded the speeches by writers! Have the 5,000 delegates really come here from all over the country, as Comrade Bondarev suggested from this rostrum, to solve the issue of whether Vikulov should stay in the magazine for another 20 years, or whether this post should remain his for life? In his speech Comrade Baklanov referred to the problem of the writer's responsibility for his work and raised other issues. Here is what he said:

[Begin Baklanov recording] We are not the first to live on earth, and mankind has accumulated experience. In part, this experience shows the following: On more than one occasion people have fought for their enslavement with the zeal and passion with which one should fight only for freedom. When the 1937 trials were staged in the Hall of Columns and people were holding banners demanding capital punishment, they did not suspect that it would soon become their lot too. Those who fight against glasnost today are fighting for their own enslavement. When he needs to say his word, he will be denied this word too. What kind of socialism can there be without glasnost? Socialism without glasnost.

I second what has been said here, and this is what I want to say myself: We need a law on the press. There must be a law on the press. [faint applause] The press cannot subsist on a whim: Today it is for glasnost, and tomorrow it may be against it. The press should be made responsible for irresponsible articles.

Let us be honest: We do not yet have democracy. We are just beginning to learn it. The upper echelons still do not believe that the law applies to them too, and at the bottom there is an opinion that democracy means everything is permitted. There is no freedom without responsiblity, and there cannot be.

Second issue: The fate of POW's and those MIA's in Afghanistan has now become our national fate. People write that they are prepared to give everything they have to rescue our boys. To what a high level the public consciousness has risen compared with our past when

millions of MIA's remained lying unburied in fields and forests! Shameful articles branding them as nearly traitors are still appearing to this day.

Something about judicial and legal reform: there are proposals that the number of jurors be increased in individual cases. No, comrades, I see it differently. I believe that the number of jurors should be increased, and they should be authorized to pass a guilty or not guilty verdict. This is totally different, and it has existed in Russia before.

Here is something I would like to say. In Australia, when a future pilot passes a test, he is asked the following question among others: You are piloting a two-seater plane. Imagine that the queen of England falls out from the other seat. What are you going to do? Some say: I will shoot myself. Others suggest jumping after her and catching her in the air. The right answer is: Balance the aircraft after it has lost part of its load and continue the flight. So, during restructuring we will have to level out the aircraft after losing part of the load and continue the flight on more than one occasion. [applause] [end recording]

Baklanov Address Published

PM0307143088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 7

[Speech by G.Ya. Baklanov, chief editor of the journal ZNAMYA, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Delegates! What lofty thought, in the course of the discussion of the report, inspired yesterday's speeches by metallurgy workers and the chairman of the Chuvash Kolkhoz, and the speech we have just heard by Fedor Trofimovich Morgun. And how narrow-minded and touchy were the writers' speeches 2 days ago, speeches that did not extend beyond their own problems. (Applause) Have 5,000 delegates from all over the country really assembled, as Bondarev said from this platform, in order to decide the question: Should Vikulov stay on the journal for another 20 years as he has done, or should the post be his for life? Is he trying to be like the fairytale hero Ilya Muromets, who sat on a stove for 30 years and then another 3?! But more of that later.

Esteemed Comrades! (Disturbance in the auditorium. Applause) We are not the first to live on this earth. (Disturbance in the auditorium. Applause)

Are you sending me off the platform, or expressing approval?

We are not the first to live on this earth, and mankind has accumulated experience. Some of that experience shows that in their history people have many times fought for their own enslavement with the kind of energy and passion that should only be used in fighting for freedom. When the 1937 trials were in progress in the Hall of Columns and people came out carrying banners demanding the death penalty, they did not suspect that soon they too would be dealt with in the same way.

Those who are fighting against glasnost today are fighting for their own enslavement. When they need to say something, they too will be denied the right to speak. What kind of socialism will there be without glasnost? The socialism of the voiceless [bezglasnyye]? How about it, comrades, have we taken one gulp of freedom and choked on it? Have we all started coughing?... (Disturbance in the auditorium.)

I support the proposal that was made here, I too wanted to propose it: We need a law on the press. A law on the press is necessary. The press cannot exist by command, today for glasnost, tomorrow against glasnost. The press must bear the responsibility for irresponsible items. We need a law. We need a firm legal foundation. Let us be honest; we do not have democracy yet, but are only beginning to learn it. In the topmost echelons many people still do not believe that the laws were written for them too, while people at the bottom think: Democracy, that means I am allowed to do anything. But freedom without responsibility does not and cannot exist. But not only officials... (Disturbance in the auditorium.)

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, all the same, I think we should listen to everyone's views. You will form an idea, after all. You want to know the views, you want to know, we have heard this during these days, the views, the position of every member of the Politburo, members of the government, leaders, and the views of those who are involved in one way or another in the great cause. In this case it is a writer from the front line, an editor. So let him speak out, let us listen, and you will know. You will know, and you can judge. Let him speak. Otherwise we are just wasting our time. Democracy presupposes this: Let every delegate speak, and you can ask for the floor and express your attitude. Or draw your conclusions and adhere to your own opinion, and you will know what Comrade Baklanov's position is.

G.Ya. Baklanov: I have received a number of telegrams and telephone calls. I handed over to the presidium today one telegram that was addressed to Yuriy Dmitriyevich Chernichenko and me, from Kharkov University. This is its content: "Comrade writers, is no one going to reply to Nina Andreyeva and Yuriy Bondarev?" The presidium has the telegram. (Disturbance in the auditorium.)

So, comrades, I will quote, since there is this telegram. I will quote a few phrases from Bondarev's speech: "The knights of extremism, of the snap reaction"—that is about our writing on current issues. "A poison offered as a cure," "iconoclasts of thought," "history will remember us with shame and condemnation." And this is not in the time of Brezhnev, not in the time when the people's

spirit was demoralized, but today, in the time of glasnost! And he said, quoting some unnamed tractor driver, that today both a man and a fly can be swatted by a newspaper.

Our great writer Andrey Platonov worked as a janitor, but he was not afraid of being swatted by a newspaper. Only now have his works been published, thanks to glasnost. Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskiy did not live to see his long poem published. Bek, whose novel we printed and who told us more profoundly than anyone else what the administrative system is like, died before its publication. Suslov promised Grossman that his novel would not be published even in 200 years. It has now been published. All three died of cancer, and the cancer progressed rapidly. Doctors can tell you what causes a cancer to progress rapidly. You know what happened to Bulgakov. Our literature is not as warped as people have tried to make out. (Disturbance in the auditorium.)

Our literature deserves respect.

Let me go on to my second point. The fate of the prisoners and those who have disappeared without trace in Afghanistan has now become the people's fate. People write that they are willing to give everything they have to free our boys. How far the level of society's awareness has risen, if we look into the past, when millions who disappeared without trace were left to lie unburied in the fields and the forests, and ignominious articles are appearing to this day branding them all but traitors!

The withdrawal of the troops from Afghanistan took political courage and wisdom. But sending the troops in took neither of those qualities.

The mothers of men who died in Afghanistan have appealed to me, they have come to the editorial office and I have received many letters from mothers. They ask: How did it happen? Who was behind it? We know that there are even candidate members of the Politburo who only learned from the newspapers that the troops had gone into Afghanistan. Is it possible to live like this, comrades? No, it is not possible. Do we have guarantees against the repetition of such things? We do not have guarantees. It is necessary to create a mechanism that will ensure that such things do not happen again. Everyone must be responsible for what he does. Society must not take responsibility for the culprits in every case: They must be known by name!

Since the time when mankind moved on from fruit-gathering and hunting to agriculture and livestock raising, he has mastered a simple truth: You don't have to tear off the udder to get milk. First you have to feed the cow, then you have to milk it. (Disturbance in the auditorium.)

I'm finishing, comrades, don't get agitated, I'll stick it out here, I'll stick it out. Here we go. Our Ministry of Finance still adheres to the policy that it is necessary, in order to... (Disturbance in the auditorium.)

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, we should not decide things by emotions, but by open arguments and the comparison of views, which we must then express in our political principles, in our decisions. We can accept or reject the speaker's view, that is up to us, and we will decide it collectively, but not by stamping our feet. You don't like it? Perhaps the strongest reaction will be a different one. In any case, don't let anyone form the opinion that we are carried away by emotions here. Let us listen to the comrade. (Applause.)

G.Ya. Baklanov: Our Ministry of Finance still adheres to the policy that it is better to tear off the udder. Taxes enrich a state only up to a certain limit, and beyond that they ruin it. They ruin both the citizens and the state. In all this time there has not been a single bright idea from the Ministry of Finance. We would print it with pleasure, because we print bright ideas from economists.

On judicial and legal reform, it has been said in the proposals that in certain cases the number of assessors should be increased. No, comrades, that is not what I think. I think we should increase the number of assessors and allow them to bring in a verdict of guilty or not guilty. That is an entirely different form, and it existed in Russia before.

Here is what I would like to say to you about all your clapping. It did not worry me. If we do not lose our will, if we do not lose the people's confidence, we will win. In Australia, when a future pilot takes his test, they ask him this question: You are flying a two-seater plane. Imagine the queen of England falls out of the other seat. What do you do? Some say: Shoot myself, or jump out after her and catch her in mid-air. The right answer is to level out the plane after the loss of the excess cargo and continue the flight. In the course of restructuring, on many more occasions, we will have to level out the plane after the loss of excess cargo and continue the flight. (Applause)

General Gromov Address

LD0107113288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 1 Jul 88

["Excerpt" of speech by Army Commander General Gromov at 1 July session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, we entered Afghanistan at the end of 1979 at the request of that country's legitimate government and in accordance with the treaty between our countries on the basis of the well-known article of the UN Charter. Now we are leaving, again by arrangement with the Government of Afghanistan, on the basis of

agreements signed in Geneva aimed at keeping intact an independent Afghanistan in which, as is known, the counterrevolution has not laid down its weapons.

Hundreds of thousands of our lads went through a dangerous and difficult schooling in courage and heroism. One in every four of our serviceman has had orders and medals conferred on him and more than 60 of them have been awarded the lofty title of Hero of the Soviet Union. [applause]

The fatherland is warmly embracing the servicemen who are returning home. We have always been supported by the feeling of a soldier's duty, of a soldier's responsibility to his Soviet homeland, and to the long-suffering Afghan people to help in the defense against external aggression.

A great deal is now being spoken and written in the West about our defeat, about the fact that we have allegedly lost the war in Afghanistan. Our enemies and spiteful critics of all hues do not want, or more precisely, do not wish to understand that we came to Afghanistan on a mission of goodwill writ large; we came to defend the people, its children and women, the civilian villages and towns, and, finally, that country's national independence and sovereignty. And we have fulfilled this task. [applause]

And we have fulfilled this task. We have fulfilled it at a high price, but we have fulfilled it with honor. With our political, military, economic, and cultural assistance, the Republic of Afghanistan has been preserved as an independent and friendly state.

I think that precisely this circumstance, precisely these results, would have to be called our achievement. At any rate it is precisely with such a feeling that our soldiers and officers are returning from Afghanistan. The Soviet people rightly call them proudly internationalist servicemen. [applause]

Analyzing our Afghan everyday reality, the heavy battles, you constantly think how quickly, when it is necessary, our young people—yesterday's pupils and students, workers and kolkhoz members, and even the so-called heavy metal fans and rockers—in the course of their service undergo a true schooling in patriotism and internationalism and address the real need to wage a fierce struggle against the enemy. I think that precisely here the mighty spiritual charge which was instilled in our people by the Communist people, Soviet rule, commanders, political workers, and party and Komsomol organizations is having its effect. [applause]

We have been doing and are doing everything in order for our people not to feel themselves cut off from the homeland. And they are indeed fully sharing its concerns and joys, feeling the working rhythm of perestroyka, democratization, glasnost, and the birth of a new moral atmosphere in society.

All internationalist servicemen, the living and the fallen, the injured and the shell-shocked, the families of those who died, all of them must be in the field of vision of the raykom, the rayispolkom, the military registration and enlistment office, the Komsomol, and the nearest military units.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are undertaking the most effective measures in order to help return home these few servicemen who for some reason or other have found themselves in captivity.

We are of the opinion that concern for the defense of our homeland and for going to its defense when necessary at present continues to be topical. The position of some people who try to assert that a military threat to our country is a concept that has become obsolete is incomprehensible. Unfortunately this is far from being the case and reality fails to confirm it.

It is also irresponsible that some people attempt to cast doubt on the feats of the soldiers-internationalists. No one, not a single person in our country, has been given the right to destroy the young people's faith in the sacredness of a combat tour of duty, which has not been lived in vain. [applause]

We see our foremost task in rallying round even closer to the CPSU Central Committee, and in responding to the decisions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference by enhancing our combat readiness, vigilance, and military discipline. Our remarkable people, including those from the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops in the Republic of Afghanistan, will without doubt take a most active part in restructuring and will implement the troop withdrawal strictly according to plan, without losses in men, leaving the best and glorious memory of themselves among the Afghan people.

Gromov Address Published

PM0207131788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 7

[Speech by B.V. Gromov, Army commander, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Delegates! At the 19th all-union party conference I am representing the thousands-strong collective of Communists from the personnel of the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops in Afghanistan as a component part of the Soviet Armed Forces. (Applause)

I was touched to the bottom of my heart by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's cordial words to the internationalist servicemen who have carried out with dignity or are still carrying out their military international duty, and I want to proffer my cordial thanks for that. (Applause)

Comrades! We went into Afghanistan at the end of 1979 at the request of that country's legitimate Government and in accordance with the treaty between our countries on the basis of a well-known article of the UN Charter. We are now leaving, again by agreement with that country's Government on the basis of agreements signed in Geneva and aimed at preserving an independent Afghanistan in which, as is well known, the counterrevolution has not laid down its arms.

The enemies of positive changes in Afghanistan, both within and beyond its borders, still nurture plans to return the people to their semifeudal past by force of arms. Any means are used to this end: terror, shelling, the senseless destruction of population centers, the mining of lines of communication, and so forth. This process is understood and given full support by the United States and the Pakistani leadership. As is well known, both these countries signed the Geneva accords. The former as a guarantor, and the latter as a full and equal participant. But this is not preventing them from continuing to move large quantities of modern weapons and munitions into Afghan territory via Pakistan, to maintain and generously fund bases and training centers for the dushmans, and—naturally—to send in their own advisers and specialists.

The war in Afghanistan is into its 9th year. Hundreds of thousands of our guys have passed through a dangerous and complex school of courage and heroism there. One out of every four of our servicemen has been awarded orders or medals, and more than sixty of them have been awarded the lofty title of Hero of the Soviet Union. (Applause) Among these are Privates Arsenov and Igolchenko, Sergeants Islamov and Kremenish, and officers Aushev and Raylyan. And 3 days ago the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decreed that this lofty title be posthumously awarded to Private Aleksandrov and Junior Sergeant Melnikov. Soviet people will never forget their sons' feats. The fatherland warmly embraces the servicemen who are returning home after carrying out their international duty.

Yes, we lost people there. Every death caused a sharp pain in our hearts. Nobody grieves alone. And these kinds of wounds only heal with time, and even then not always. But we have been supported by our sense of military duty and our soldierly duty to our Soviet motherland and the long-suffering Afghan people. We helped them to defend themselves against foreign aggression.

A great deal is currently being said and written in the West about our defeat and the fact that we allegedly lost the war in Afghanistan. Somebody rightly said that there are limits to wisdom but that stupidity is boundless. Shuffling and distorting historical facts and turning the truth on its head, our enemies and sundry spiteful critics do not want—or rather, do not wish—to realize that we came to Afghanistan on a mission of the greatest good will. We came in order to defend the people and their women and children, peaceful villages and towns, and, finally, the country's national independence and sovereignty. And we carried out this task. (Applause) At a high cost, but we carried it out with honor.

With our help—political, military, economic, and cultural—Afghanistan has been maintained as an independent friendly state. I think that this fact and these results should be termed our political, military, and moral achievements. At any rate, that is the feeling being brought back from Afghanistan by our officers and men whom the Soviet people proudly call internationalist servicemen. (Applause)

I did three tours in Afghanistan. I held posts at three different levels there and witnessed cruel and inhuman crimes by the armed counterrevolution against the Afghan people. They bestially murdered and tortured hundreds of thousands of ordinary people in that country and destroyed around 2,000 schools, hundreds of mosques and hospitals, and more than 140 national economic installations. And each time I returned to Afghanistan I became even prouder of our soldiers and our people who treat the suffering of a foreign child, a woman's tears, a smashed home, and a maimed destiny as their own problem and their own misfortune.

Analyzing our time in Afghanistan and the hard battles, one constantly thinks of how quickly, when the need presented itself, our young servicemen—yesterday's students, workers, kolkhoz members, and even so-called "heavy metal" fans and rockers—underwent a genuine schooling in patriotism and internationalism and realized the real need for a bitter struggle against the enemy. I think that this was where the strong spiritual inspiration imbued in our people by the Communist Party, Soviet power, commanders, political workers, and party and Komsomol organizations came into its own. (Applause)

The process of the spiritual transition from peacetime to military service is a process of turning our moral and political potential into a real combat factor and a most important component of success in fighting.

I would make one more point in this connection. We have done and are doing everything to ensure that our men do not feel cut off from the motherland. And they indeed live and breathe its concerns and its joys, sensing the working rhythm of restructuring, democratization, glasnost, and the birth of a new moral atmosphere in society. The political training of the personnel has received a new boost. Monologues are increasingly being replaced by dialogues. There has been a particular increase in the interest shown by all our servicemen in the political life of the party and country since April 1985. The newspapers and magazines that we receive over there are reread many times and every television program gives rise to animated discussions, arguments, and proposals.

Comrades! Permit me to wholeheartedly express sincere gratitude and cordial thanks to our people, party, its Central Committee, and the Soviet Government for the immense concern—both material and moral—which they have shown for our servicemen in Afghanistan. (Applause)

Party and soviet workers, representatives of the arts and culture, and many of our country's best artistes are continually journeying out to visit troops.

There is another side to this question. Namely, concrete concern for those who have come home. All internationalist servicemen, living and dead, wounded and shell-shocked, and bereaved families should all be watched over by the party raykom and rayispolkom, the military commissariat, the Komsomol, and the nearest military unit.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are now taking the most effective measures to help bring home the few servicemen who, for whatever reason, were captured.

When we started our troop withdrawal, esteemed comrades, we gave all Western correspondents—and there were many of them—the opportunity to visit any unit and any garrison, and we helped them to meet with all categories of servicemen. During their interviews the correspondents were struck by the awareness and political and cultural erudition of our servicemen, their intellect, and their ability to think and talk freely. For many of them this was an eye-opener. They realized that for many years they had themselves been the targets of anti-Soviet propaganda.

Unfortunately, not all Western correspondents then wrote accurate descriptions and articles. But the ice had been broken. I would like to think that here too the lesson of truth will reach all people of good will and create an accurate world public opinion about the true role of Soviet servicemen on friendly Afghan soil.

The war in Afghanistan undoubtedly forced us servicemen to come to certain conclusions. Initially we had to rapidly improve the training of the personnel, particularly in mountain combat operations, sharply enhance their attention to route-march training, and learn to conduct anti-mine warfare, to coordinate cooperation between various categories of troops better, and to operate at night.

Nor can we fail to note that, on the whole, young people's training for military service also requires radical improvement. Not all young lads—even those who are quite strong—can initially stand the tough work. We need a more systematic and comprehensive resolution of the task of providing moral and psychological tempering and initial military training.

We believe that concern for our motherland's defense and our readiness to come to its protection when necessary continues to be topical today. And the position of certain people who try to claim that a military threat to our country is an obsolete concept is incomprehensible. Unfortunately, this is by no means the case.

The fact that certain people try to cast doubt on the feats of internationalist servicemen is also irresponsible. Nobody in our country has the right to destroy young people's faith in the sacred nature of military service that has not been in vain (Applause), to besmirch our combat traditions, or to belittle in words and deeds the sacred constitutional duty of defending our motherland. (Applause)

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report formulated a fundamental provision about the priority of qualitative parameters both in technical supply and in the training and education of our army personnel. These demands clarify the goals of our restructuring and provide clear guidelines for the work of military cadres, political organs, and party organizations. The switch to qualitative parameters is already being seen in the enhancement of the role of military science on the basis of the new defensive military doctrine, the revision of obsolete concepts of the art of war, the intensification of combat and political training, and the resolute renewal of the content and methods of party political work.

I completely agree with and support the provision in the party conference draft resolution on the progress in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, which states that the conference wholly approves the decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan on the basis of the Geneva accords and on the basis of relations with that country as an independent, neutral, and nonaligned state.

In conclusion, comrade delegates, I want to say that Army Communists and all army personnel are united with the party and the people in the struggle to implement the revolutionary course of restructuring. We see it as our paramount task to rally our ranks even more closely around the CPSU Central Committee, and to respond to the resolutions of the 19th all-union party conference with further improvements in combat readiness, vigilance, and military discipline. And our marvelous people, including those in the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops in Afghanistan, will undoubtedly participate in restructuring in the most active way, implement the troop withdrawal strictly according to plan, without losses of men, and leave the Afghan people with the finest and brightest memories of them. (Applause)

Ukraine's Oleynik Speaks

LD0107155288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Excerpts] Debates on the CPSU Central Committee report continue in the Kremlin. Among those who took part in the discussion was Boris Oleynik, secretary of the board of the USSR and Ukrainian Writers' Unions.

[Begin Oleynik recording] The Communists, nonparty members, representatives of informal organizations, right up to the rock and heavy metal fans with whom I, as a delegate, happened to meet were unanimous in the main instructions: To try firmly to insure by all constitutional means that renewal is irreversible.

I would like to say that recently, in our justified breaking of the cult, we—in our not always noble anger—have thown stones at the entire people by subjecting almost everything that they have done to doubt. [passage omitted in which Oleynik recalls childhood dream depicting the suffering of Soviet women, who gave up everything in the name of Stalin and the homeland.]

I have a natural pride in my socialist homeland. To forget this and to forget the fact that our victory represents a feat by the entire people, thus depriving several generations of the meaning of life, is a great and inexcusable sin. In the opposite case, it is precisely our memory that can provide fertile ground for thistles, among which we will not notice the poisonous seeds of a new cult putting forth shoots. In order for this never to happen, I have been instructed to recommend and to ask to publish at last a white book about these black times, to provide precision with stenographic precision and clarity not just a final exposure of Stalin, but also to determine the degree of guilt of everyone, in his circle; and to name not just victims, but also those who premeditated and carried out the acts of lawlessness, and to expose the names of informers who supplied the executioners with compromising [kompromat] material. By bringing to light the names of these informers from the past, we also will inflict a preemptive strike against those who are still embarking on this dirty undertaking. [applause]

I have brought an appeal to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference from the Ukrainian public on reexamining the Ukrainian power engineering development program. More than 6,000 signatures have been placed on this appeal. The arrogance and scornful attitude of certain union-level offices toward the fate of the Ukraine border not merely on a kind of uncharitable cruelty, but even verge upon a pure insult to national dignity. I recall how some who demanded the construction of the Chernobyl AES ridiculed a Ukrainian proverb by saying: Oh, yes, it is so safe that one could install a reactor under a bed of newlyweds!

We will not lower ourselves to recommending that the mockers should set up their beds next to the fourth reactor, but we are entitled to demand that the designers should be brought to personal account. They permitted the grossest errors in the selection of sites for AES's in the Ukraine. In particular, the construction of the Rovno AES on [word indistinct] soil already has led to the overexpenditure of R100 million. The construction of the Crimea AES on tectonic fractures under conditions of the rising of subsoil waters (?will bring) catastrophe. And there is the history of the (Shchegerinskaya) AES, the construction of which they promised to halt under public pressure, and the fact of the Zaporozhye AES, which discards polluted [word indistinct] water in the Kakhovka reservoir, from which water is fed to the Krivbass and to the Zaporozhye, Kherson, and Crimea Oblasts.

They also want to shove onto us a Danube-Dnepr canal, that is, to transfer the sewage water of all Europe into the Dnepr. What is this? Thoughtlessness? Or criminal intent, as is said among the people? Whatever it may be, I have received a mandate from Communists to demand that this debauch be brought under public control and to stop visiting designers and planners who fail to take into consideration either the interests or even life [word indistinct] itself. There is no restructuring in the pipeline. Everything is pretentious. To strictly tie oneself to the rule of two terms at elections, I would personally put forward a proposal: A person has, let us say, worked two terms of office; after that, let him throw himself from the summit of the power pyramid directly into the ocean of practical life and struggle with the elements for a minimum of 5 years.

After this respite [luftpause], he can be elected once again, if he served his two previous terms not just well, but with his heart in the job, if his age and health permit, and of course, if this is what the people want. On the subject of the attestation of Communists, I would dwell on the following variant: Simply to legalize the equality of rights of party and nonparty members in the nomination process. Let us be frank to the very end. Some people strove to get a party card as if it were a ration card. Of course, the party is not a cooperative, but everything lies in the fact that they do not keep (?career-mongers) in cooperatives; you have to work. So why have (?career-mongering) in the party? [applause]

It is timely to join two levels that have taken shape in restructuring. The first, where with perspiring brows scientists and theoreticians work, they already have restructured to the point that suddenly they are asking themselves the question: What have we built as a whole? And this asked by people in the 8th decade of Soviet power, who up to the last moment have been earning money on the theoretical basis of this very something. [applause] And truly frightfully distant [words indistinct] of the second level, where the people really work, [words indistinct] like December, with the substantial difference that the cause of the latter is not lost. However, where those of the first level are concerned, then for the moment there are very few, if (?any), business-like proposals. [applause]

It is important also to bring to an end the matter of underground millionaires. Among the latter, I assure you, you will not find even one [word indistinct] Morozov, who would voluntarily give up their accumulated wealth [laughter] for revolutionary restructuring. [passage indistinct] [end recording]

Oleynik on AES 'Saturation'

PM0407094188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 8

[Speech by B.I. Oleynik, secretary of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR Writers Unions' Boards, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Communists, nonparty members, and members of informal associations right down to rockers and "heavy metal" fans whom I, as a delegate, have had the opportunity to meet were unanimous in their main instructions: To firmly use all constitutional means to ensure that renewal becomes irreversible. Glory and hosanna to restructuring, if for nothing else then for the shattering discovery that, in our theoretical acceleration of "developed socialism," we seem to have leaped across almost an entire phase of real socialism! Having mapped out the best possible highway, we got going, launched into the sky the hot air balloons of imagined prosperity, and for years on end tried to make them dock with the not altogether favorable reality. The spotlight of glasnost revealed even more starkly the blank spots in our fatherland's distant and very recent past, the gaping black footprints left behind by the jackboots of the cult.

But I would like to say that recently, correctly trying to smash up the cult, we—in our not always noble anger—have been throwing stones at the entire people and raising doubts about almost everything they have accomplished. I still see in my mind a sight dating back to my wartime childhood—an endless field full of large gray lumps. But take a closer look: These are no ordinary lumps, they are the gray sweaters on the backs of our women, our mothers, sisters, wives, and girlfriends bent over in hard labor not for Stalin but for their men who were fighting fascism, and it was for victory's sake that they gave up their beauty, withered ahead of time, and their last ounce of strength. For the sake of beloved country, about which some people are now expressing doubts: Did it ever, and does it still exist, this country of ours? I don't know about others, but I and those who sent me to the conference have our motherland—the Soviet Ukraine. (Applause) And we also have our country—the USSR. (Applause) And I feel a natural pride in my socialist fatherland.

To forget this, to forget that our victory was a feat by all the people, and thus to deprive the life of several generations of all meaning, is a great and unforgivable sin. Our literature and all branches of the arts must consolidate rather than destroy the ties between generations, it must remember not only the bad but also the great and abiding accomplishments of our forbearers. (Applause) Otherwise, we may end up in a state of amnesia, amid overgrown thistles, totally failing to notice the poisonous seeds of a new cult sprouting among their shoots. And in order to prevent this happening ever again, I was instructed to recommend, to request at long last the publication of a "White Book" about those dark ages which would finally, with stenographic precision and accuracy, not only expose Stalin but also determine the degree of guilt attached to all those around him, and name not only the victims but also those who conceived and performed acts of illegality. (Applause)

And since persecutions in our republic started long before 1937, it would also be worth making public the cause of the famine in 1933, which cost the lives of millions of Ukrainians, and listing the names of those who are guilty of this tragedy. (Applause)

Finally, to expose by name the informers who supplied the executioners with "compromising material"; by "spotlighting" the names of the "stool pigeons" of the past we would also deliver a preventive strike against those who are now only intending to embark on such a vile undertaking. (Applause)

One of the most burdensome legacies of the cult is the perversion of Lenin's nationalities policy. It is not worth looking for culprits at the regional level. The calamity is, after all, universal. In this regard, both the effect and the cause are equally lamentable. The effect, in the Ukraine in particular, is this: The national language is only skirting around the borders of the people's spiritual and material production activity. It seems to be gradually withdrawing from official documents, from state and party usage. Furthermore, many cities no longer have schools teaching the native language. Students in almost all VUZ' have no opportunity to learn in their mother tongue, let alone children in kindergartens.

There must be no variant readings on this issue. It is necessary to give native tongues at state level a most-favored status for operations in all spheres and at all levels of society, backing theory with binding laws, right up to bringing to book persons who hinder the development of national culture. (Applause)

This naturally gives rise to the problem of cultivating culture in interethnic relations—and not just in the humanitarian sense. I have brought an appeal by the republic's public to the 19th all-union party conference "On Reviewing the Program for the Development of the Power Industry in the Ukraine," carrying more than 6,000 signatures. The haughty arrogance and scorn which some union offices, and mainly the Ministry of Power and Electrification, show for the Ukraine's fate borders not so much on merciless cruelty as on an insult to national dignity. I recall how some people, when pushing through the construction of the Chernobyl AES, ridiculed the "Ukrainian syndrome" and said: Yes, it is so safe that the reactor could be installed beneath a newlywed couple's bed.

We will not sink so low as to suggest that those who ridiculed us should make their own beds near the No 4 reactor. But we are entitled to demand that the planners guilty of gross miscalculations in the choice of sites for AES' in the Ukraine be held personally responsible. In particular, the construction of the Rovno AES on karst

ground has already resulted in the overexpenditure of many millions of the people's rubles. The construction of the Crimean AES on tectonic faults near rising underground water is fraught with disaster. And how about the planned pairing of the No 3 and No 4 power units at Chernobyl AES, how about the radiation-ecological situation which developed after the Chernobyl AES accident in Kiev, Zhitomir, Chernigov, Rovno, and Cherkassy Oblasts and in some rayons belonging to our blue-eyed sister, Belorussia?

And how about the story of the construction of the Chigirin AES which, it was promised under public pressure, was to be suspended? Rumors are circulating that it is still going on.

It is well known that the Ukraine ranks among the last in the country in terms of per capita availability of water resources. And yet they want to land us with the Danube-Dnieper Canal—in other words, to pump all of Europe's effluent into the Dnieper. What is this—lack of thought or malicious intent, as people say? Whatever. I was given instructions by the Communists to demand the public monitoring of this outrage and the withdrawal of all the newly arrived planners who are wandering all over the Ukraine and other republics like plantation owners, disregarding the interests and even the actual life of the aborigines. (Applause)

The appeal in question offers scientifically substantiated alternatives. There is no need to start right away "pinning" badges to the effect that some people want AES' not in the Ukraine, but in somebody else's backyard. No, we are certainly in favor of developing the power industry. But there are limits, there are saturation limits which it would be simply criminal to exceed.

There are no trivia in restructuring, everything is important. There must be rigorous adherence to the rule of two terms in elected office. I personally would propose this: Say someone has worked out his two terms. After that, let him jump straight from the apex of the pyramid of power into the rough waters of practical life and let him fight the elements for at least 5 years. After this, after this break, he could be re-elected provided, of course, he has not just spent the two terms in question quietly sitting back but has worked wholeheartedly, provided his age and health permit him, and provided of course people want him back. On this point, and despite our diametrically opposed outlooks on life, I absolutely agree with U.S. President Reagan. Indeed, why hurt people's feelings if they want to reelect somebody?

Speaking about the certification of Communists, I would choose this option: simply legalize the equality of both party and nonparty members when it comes to advancing up the hierarchical ladder. This would have a refreshing effect. After all, let us be perfectly frank: Some people have pursued the party ticket like a bread ration card. Of course, the party is not a cooperative venture. The point is, cooperatives do not keep on any careerists: You have to work there. So why have careerists in the party? (Applause)

We must finally, and promptly, bring together the two layers that have developed in the course of restructuring. The first figurative layer is where scientists and theoreticians are working with sweat on their brows and have restructured all the way to the point where they have suddenly started asking themselves: What, if anything, have we built? It is where now, in the 8th decade of Soviet power, this question is being asked by people who have until the very last moment been earning money by providing a theoretical substantiation of the "something" that has been built! (Applause)

Indeed, there is a vast distance separating them from those in the second layer, where the people are really working! Almost like the Decembrists, with the substantial difference that their cause has not collapsed, even though those in the first layer have so far produced hardly any effective suggestions. (Applause)

It is also important to bring to a conclusion the case of "underground millionaires." Since, I can assure you, there is not a single Savva Morozov to be found among them who would voluntarily sacrifice his accumulated wealth for the revolutionary restructuring, all the available resources of the scientific and technical revolution must be geared to detecting the handmade gold deposits and handing over all the currency that is dug up to the Children's Fund: After all, it is primarily the children whom these scoundrels have robbed. The rest can go to the Soviet Culture Fund, which would put this gold to good use, cultivating a sense of moderation in the present and future generations. (Applause)

Academician Primakov Address

LD0107133388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Debates continued on the Central Committee report at today's morning session. Eight delegates spoke. The morning session concluded with a speech by Academician Primakov, director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations of the country's Academy of Sciences.

[Begin Primakov recording] The main question of our conference, from whichever way and angle you look at it, is the party's role in restructuring. In my opinion there are no grounds for saying that any of the speakers—and I would even say so to anyone present here in the hall—has any doubt about the guiding role of the CPSU in our society. It is not even a question of, or it is not so much a quesstion of, a single-party system being a historical one in our country. The main thing, it seems to me, is the clear conclusion that any alternative to this, in the present historic conditions, would inflict irreparable damage to restructuring in the framework of socialism.

This is the main criterion for us today. At the same time it must be borne in mind that it was the CPSU which boldly advocated a decisive break with disinformation in the period of the cult of personality and stagnation. Nor should we close our eyes to the fact that ideas of a multiparty system could, first and foremost, be used by nationalistic and dogmatic elements of all hues. And that would be a terrible blow to restructuring.

But how can we ensure that the single-party system functions more effectively in our country and how can we reveal and develop its democratic potential? These words are like those that enthused Lenin in the last years of his life. In this connection, I would like to dwell on problems of the democratization of the process of the way we adopt our decisions, both economic and political. Debates on television in pages of newspapers and magazines have already become the norm in the country. Various views and ideas confront each other in them. A logical continuation of such debates, the next step, should be the formation of various versions and alternatives. The opportunity of choosing from many versions is one of the most important indications of the switch away from command-administrative methods. It is an indication that in the process of preparing decisions specialists, science as a whole, and the public are really being drawn in, not just in words, but in deeds. Moreover, without choice scope is created for decisions which have not been properly thought through.

It is possible in this connection to refer to an event of 10 years ago, connected with the entry of our troops into Afghanistan. We pay tribute, we are proud of, and we bow our heads before those who fell. We are proud of our internationalist servicemen. There is absolutely no doubt about this. This is our pride in our lads who were in Afghanistan.

Both the situation on the Afghan border and external interference in its internal affairs and the international situation as a whole required counteraction from our side in the interests of peace and stability in the region. But the nature of these counteractions was obviously determined without properly studying the various alternatives of a political settlement. Moreover, it was done without a real understanding of either the situation in Afghanistan or the inevitability of the consequences of the measures taken.

All this placed a heavy burden on the shoulders of our country and our people. In this light it is difficult to overestimate such an achievement of the restructuring period as the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan.

Take another example: how we reacted to one step or another by the United States in the arms race which has been imposed upon us. Without putting up various alternatives and views it could hardly have been possible in the past to avoid mistakes. Only today are we beginning to ensure our security chiefly through political measures in the military sphere on the basis of reasonable sufficiency. This means that in recent years alone, not forgetting for a second about the sacred cause of the security of the state, we are beginning to think about how to guarantee it using minimum resources, which we are being forced to divert from the development of the national economy and the enhancement of the prosperity of our people.

I would not like to restrict myself to these examples. Our practice of restructuring poses the question: If shortcomings emerge clearly and precisely in the decisions we are adopting, why should they not be corrected right away and dramatically? All the more so since we have individual positive examples of this. I have in mind the work which has already begun on reviewing the decree on taxes on cooperatives and those in the cooperative movement. Following Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's speech at the Supreme Soviet session, and many speeches by delegates, work really began on this endeavor. In fact, this instance is typical in two ways. First, in that no important decisions should be adopted without serious preliminary discussion, involving scientific circles and the public; and second, ill-considered decisions must by boldly revoked.

As far as preliminary discussion is concerned, many people here have spoken against science and, in particular they spoke about economic science, and so on. Comrades, we, of course, are to blame for many things. I can say that bluntly. But, at the same time, let's not go too far. For example, on this decision, this decree, there was an opinion by the Academy of Sciences. But it was not, unfortunately, taken into account, and the question of the decree on tax was settled in a secret way. So we had to correct this matter. There will be mistakes. A review will not only not weaken some of the things which have been ill-considered, on the contrary it will strengthen the party's prestige and once more demonstrate that it gives paramount importance not to considerations of prestige but the interests of the cause. [end recording]

Comrades Grossu, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia; Makhkamov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tadzhikistan; Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Education; and Volodin, first secretary of the Rostov party obkom, took part in the debate of the CPSU Central Committee report at the afternoon session.

The floor was then given to delegate Yeltsin, deputy chairman of the USSR State Construction Committee.

Primakov Speech Published

PM0307144588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 8

[Speech by Ye.M. Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute, at 1 July morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! The main topic of our conference, regardless of the angle or aspect from which you look at it, is the party's role in restructuring. In my

view, there are no grounds for believing that any of the speakers—or, I would say, any of those present in this hall—has any doubts about the CPSU's leading role in our society.

It is not so much and not even only a question of the fact that the one-party system is part of our country's history. The main point, as I see it, lies in the clear-cut conclusion: In the present historical conditions, any other alternative would inflict irreparable damage to restructuring within the framework of socialism. And this is the most important criterion for us today. Moreover it must be borne in mind that it was the CPSU itself that boldly advocated a resolute break with the deformations of the period of personality cult and stagnation. It is impossible to overlook the fact that nationalistic and dogmatic elements of all hues could be the first to take advantage of the ideas of a multiparty system. And this would be a terrible blow to restructuring.

How are we to arrange it so that the one-party system functions more efficiently in our country? How are we to reveal and develop its democratic potential? These questions are similar to those which perturbed Lenin in the last years of his life.

In this context I would like to dwell on the problem of democratizing the decisionmaking process in our country, in both the economic and the political spheres. Debates on television and in the pages of newspapers and journals have already become the norm in our country. They offer a comparison of different views and ideas. The shaping of different options and alternatives ought to become the logical continuation of such debates, the next step in them. The opportunity to choose between numerous options is indeed one of the most important indicators of a move away from administrative edict methods. This indicator shows that specialists, science as a whole, and the public are being involved for real, not in words but in deeds, in the process of preparing decisions. Furthermore, absence of choice gives scope for insufficiently considered decisions.

In this context it is possible to refer to events of some 10 years ago connected with the entry of our troops into Afghanistan. We are proud of our internationalist servicemen and we pay respect to the memory of the dead. There can be no doubt that the situation in neighboring Afghanistan, the outside interference in its internal affairs, and the international situation as a whole demanded counteractions by us in the interests of peace and stability in the region. But the nature of these counteractions was obviously determined without due study of the various options for a political solution, coupled with lack of realism in interpreting the situation in Afghanistan and the inevitable consequences of the measures being taken. All this placed a heavy burden on our country and our people. In the light of all this, it is hard to overrate such an achievement of the restructuring period as the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan.

There is another instructive example—our response to various steps by the United States in the arms race which was forced upon us. How could mistakes not have been avoided in the past without comparison of different options and views? Only today are we beginning to ensure our security primarily through political measures, and on the basis of reasonable sufficiency in the military sphere. This means that only in the last few years have we, without forgetting for a moment the sacred cause of the state's security, started thinking about how to guarantee it at the lowest possible cost, having been forced to divert funds from the development of the national economy and the enhancement of our people's prosperity.

I would not like to limit myself to just these examples. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was perfectly correct in emphasizing that the conference must concentrate on the experience of the last 3 years, on the shortcomings and mistakes, on the reserves that remained unutilized even in the course of restructuring.

In this context I would like to mention the resolution on combating drunkenness. This has already been mentioned. No one can have any doubts that the defeat of this widespread vice is one of the most important and most noble tasks in the moral, political, and, if you like, even in the economic sphere. The intention was good. And the resolution as such was also good. But how was it implemented? By using the same old administrative edict methods, without scientifically forecasting the possible outcome, and consequently without working out various options whose primary purpose would have been to reliably eradicate the practice of drinking during working hours and to sweep it away from the party and economic "etiquette."

Consequently, we lost a lot even though we did achieve some positive results. Even if nowhere else, this manifested itself in the fact that the state monopoly on the production of alcoholic beverages is being objectively undermined, a shortage of sugar has developed, while a calculation of sugar consumption per hectoliter of moonshine shows that drunkenness has not declined all that much. Moreover, drug addiction has increased. Let alone the political costs, which are also high.

In this way, our practice of restructuring is already posing the question: If there are perfectly manifest shortcomings in decisions that have been made, why not correct them immediately and radically? (Applause)

Especially since we do have individual positive examples in this regard. I have in mind the work that has already begun to revise the Decree on Taxation of Cooperatives and Cooperative Members. Indeed, this work was undertaken following Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's speech

and speeches by many delegates at the Supreme Soviet session. As a matter of fact, this case is typical in two respects: first, that no important resolutions must be adopted without serious preliminary discussion involving scientific circles and the public; second, that we must be bolder in repealing unconsidered decisions.

Many people here have criticized science, and economic science in particular. We are, of course, to blame for many things. I can bluntly say this to you. At the same time, however, there is no need to overdo things. Take, for example, the Decree on Taxation of Cooperatives and Cooperative Members which I have already mentioned. The Academy of Sciences expressed a clearly negative opinion on its draft, but this opinion was unfortunately not taken into account; the decree was drafted behind closed doors, and now it has to be amended.

We must not be afraid to admit, where appropriate, that decisions are wrong. We are on the path of restructuring. We are on the move, we are daring in many respects, we are accomplishing a revolution. Therefore, there will also be some mistakes. The correction of these mistakes not only does not weaken but, on the contrary, actually consolidates the party's prestige and demonstrates yet again that it places the main stress not on considerations of prestige but on the interest of the cause. (Applause)

The next question: On scientifically working out the phased implementation of the main tasks of restructuring. Much is being said about this. But we still lack a clear-cut concept of the stage-by-stage development of the economy and of society as a whole. Blame for this rests with scientists and practitioners alike. Meanwhile, reliable progress can be achieved only by consistently solving tasks in total conformity with the actual potential at every stage. Otherwise, even the most noble and most progressive ideas are likely to be discredited.

This is what happened to state orders. Much has already been said about this. I also fear that the same fate could befall self-financing, since enterprises are not able to use the money they earn to acquire the equipment, raw materials, and construction materials they need.

The last question on which I would like to dwell is the urgent need to internationalize social life in the Soviet Union.

Recent events in many of the country's regions have shown how important this is. Over a long period of time we used to set up international education commissions and friendship committees, to send delegations from one republic to another, and to organize major and minor festivals of fraternal literature and culture, in the belief that this was virtually all we needed to do to bring nations closer together. Even now proposals are being made to set up a ministry or a committee for nationalities affairs so as to bring them closer together. I am not raising doubts about the usefulness of this proposal, but I would nevertheless like to say that decisive importance attaches to the creation of international structures spreading to all aspects of our life. This is what I have in mind in particular.

The main emphasis in the past was placed on national, or at least local, cadres in the republics' entire party and economic system, from top to bottom. It seems that now it is necessary to supplement this with horizontal rotation of cadres on a countrywide basis. This, incidentally, is one of the lessons from the latest events in Azerbaijan and Armenia. Only such horizontal movement of party and economic officials can create a single international alloy in the Soviet Union, which will be much more monolithic than the sum of national formations leaning toward exclusiveness.

I say all this without in any way underrating the importance of the development of all nations and ethnic groups in the Soviet Union. But this development must not be transplanted away from the international soil. This is especially important now, when emphasis is being placed on greater local independence. Without the practical application of such a transfusion of cadres, the correct, the very correct decision on independence could result in growth of nationalism.

Thorough attention must be given to the problem of the rapprochement, the integration if you like, of national intelligentsias since, unfortunately, it is a part of the intelligentsia that plays the role of the main proponent of nationalist ideas. In this context invaluable importance lies in ties between the country's VUZ's, which shape tomorrow's intelligentsia of union republics. Hitherto these ties have been clearly inadequate. There is no widespread practice whereby professors and lecturers famous in their field of knowledge travel from one republic to another to give lectures, not only single lectures but entire courses of lectures. Such mobility, incidentally, exists in all countries in the world. As for our own country, and in addition to its great importance as regards the professional training of students, it could take on the load of young people's international education.

And finally, about the internationalization of science. This juxtaposition of words even has a strange sound to it, since science is international by nature. But what has happened in our country? Very often, and for considerations of prestige, some union republics have their academies develop complete cycles of disciplinary research even though they have neither the traditions, nor the material base, nor the cadres to do this. Meanwhile, this is elevated almost to the rank of tremendous achievements along the path to creating or developing national civilization.

I ask you not to misunderstand me. I am, of course, in favor of the development of science in all union republics. But let us nevertheless proceed from the premise that it is necessary to create the cells of a single all-Union science. Only with such an approach will science become an integrating force.

Comrades! Being at the head of restructuring, our party has proved that it is society's leader. It is necessary to do everything to ensure that no doubts at all could be raised about this ever again, under any circumstances. (Applause)

Makhkamov on Local Potential

PM0607085988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 88 Second Edition p 9

[Speech by K.M. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, at 1 July afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades! Judging by the information pouring in to the Presidium, millions of people from the Bering Strait to the Black Sea, from the Kola Peninsula to the Pamir Mountains, are for the 4th day watching and listening with emotion and concern, confidence and hope, as their emissaries, the conference delegates, honestly and frankly discuss the question of how to deepen and make irreversible the revolutionary restructuring that has developed in our country on the initiative and under the leadership of the party. Those were precisely the instructions that the Communist and working people of mountainous Tajikistan gave to their delegates.

From this platform we have heard a profound analysis of the path traveled since the April plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress, the state of the economy and its upsurge, the political situation in the country, and the party's tasks at the new stage of the deepening of restructuring.

The frank and businesslike exchange of opinions here reflects the spirit of restructuring, glasnost, and the democratization of all aspects of our society's life.

Opinions have been expressed that supposedly the country's economy has not yet emerged from a state of stagnation, but I fundamentally disagree with that contention. Surely the fact that, thanks to the efforts of the party and the people, the country's slide toward economic and sociopolitical crisis has been halted is a tremendous achievement?

Since the Central Committee April plenum, the economic reform has been producing positive results in our republic also. But our results in implementing the social program for developing the agro-industrial complex still do not accord with the aims of the 27th party congress. One of the reasons for the many problems is that at a certain moment there emerged inconsistency and dissipation of efforts in resolving economic tasks and the stage-by-stage approach was violated in fulfilling the program. Meanwhile, people managed to develop a mental attitude expecting swift results from restructuring, especially with regard to improving living standards. The mood for serious, creative labor was pushed into the background. This shows a certain deficiency in the work of the republic's party organizations. This also happens because a number of elements of the economic mechanism have still not been straightened out; the balanced nature of plans in the sphere of capital construction by and large only exists on paper. A multitude of instructions and other normative documents barring the way to economically accountable principles still exist.

We realize that the reform began after the plans had been approved. But this cannot be allowed to serve as justification for conservatism and inertia.

Unity of word and deed is a most important guarantee of the success of restructuring. It is precisely this that people expect of us, especially in social policy. But this divergence has still not been overcome. Let everyone ask himself: Do our plans always tally with the existing resources and potential? I am referring above all to capital construction. In Tajikistan today the construction program for the second half of the year is not backed up with basic material resources. What kind of results will we have to show at the end of the year? Clearly, unless urgent measures are taken, much that has been planned will not be carried out. The divergence between word and deed is threatening to reduce the people's trust in restructuring. We expect realism in economic policy. Here it is very important to have a concept of the reform of price formation as soon as possible so it can then be widely discussed.

Another issue. As is well known, economic work is regulated by documents from central organs. But unfortunately sometimes these fail to take into account the specific, concrete situation at local level. For instance, they prescribe that 70 percent of capital investment in water resources construction must go on comprehensively restructuring the irrigated land. But what is to happen in Tajikistan, which is 93 percent mountains and where there is a manpower surplus and less than 0.12 hectares of irrigated plowland per capita? That is one of the lowest indicators in the country. Moreover, it is tending to decrease. And only about 10 percent of the irrigated area in our republic requires reconstruction. The question arises: How are we to fulfill the Food Program, whose importance has been so pointedly mentioned here? Surely it is better to trust us to decide ourselves how much land to reconstruct and how much new land to commission in the light of the established long-term quota for water consumption?

Inertia in the style and methods of leadership by central economic organs has still not been overcome. They still pin a great many hopes on various conferences. Summonses to Moscow are like a natural disaster. Over the course of last year and the 1st 5 months of this year the deputy chairmen of the republic's Council of Ministers spent almost 12 months in Moscow and over this period the ministers and top people from republican departments spent around 900 days in Moscow, not to mention their deputies. It mounts up to entire 5-year periods. We

think that, given the contemporary potential of information technology and communications, there is no need for such frequent trips. And we ought to save the funds and lighten at least a little the load on transport.

During the discussion of the Theses in the republic there were many proposals regarding ways of enhancing the role of primary party organizations and the foundations of the party. This is understandable. For the people judge the party as a whole according to these organizations' work.

The activity of grassroots party links and the enhancement of their role depend to a great extent on the person heading them. Usually these are people who are not released from their main job, but each of them bears daily responsibility before the party for political leadership of the collective. And it would be correct to display more concern for them.

This can be done as follows: On the one hand, the number of full-time party organization secretaries should be increased, with this question being considered not according to the number of Communists but according to the number of working people in the collective. On the other hand, part-time secretaries should be given free days to carry out party political work. The expenditure for these purposes can come from the funds released by reducing the size of the party apparatus.

We all realize that restructuring needs powerful and effective ideological support. However, it is annoying that for a number of reasons today a considerable proportion of ideological workers has proved not to be ready to operate in an atmosphere of democratic transformations and growing public activeness.

There is no question that the absolute majority of the people have properly perceived the democratization of all aspects of society's life and glasnost. But, unfortunately, opposite phenomena also occur. We all witness how individuals and also groups of people calling themselves fighters for justice are trying to get into the limelight today, sometimes with some success. Their true essence is demagoguery, however. As yet we have no experience of combating this new phenomenon by means of democracy. A weapon against this must be created. In our view, the weapon could be laws on glasnost and the press. The mass media must act more resolutely and vigorously. True, this sphere is far more difficult for them than articles about leaders who are bureaucrats. There is also a need for urgent retraining of all ideological cadres in the party apparatus and for the updating of their theoretical baggage, especially with regard to the profound interpretation of Lenin's legacy and the ability to employ it not just in the form of quotations but as a practical guide. In school the history and social sciences examinations have been canceled, but what is to become of the party's ideological cadres, who are now facing a most difficult examination?

We think timely measures to help them are required. In the sphere of international education a question that deserves attention is the organization of constant interrepublican contacts on practical spheres of economic and cultural cooperation. Life itself has forced us to reach this conclusion. For many years there was friction in certain adjoining regions of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. Recent events have shown what this can lead to if we continue to sit on our different sides of the mountain ranges and pretend that nothing special is happening.

In the last 4 or 5 months leaders and representatives of the public of our republics have repeatedly met at the very highest level without any minutes being taken. Important steps have been taken in optimizing their relations and a number of negative accretions have been removed. The measures to reorganize the USSR Supreme Soviet, which we approve, will certainly help to solve the problem of negative relations to a new qualitative standard.

The mass media, radio, and television are called upon to play an important role in strengthening the peoples' friendship. Better use could be made of the tremendous potential of television here. To be specific, in addition to the two all-union television programs there should be another, let us provisionally call it "Unbreakable Union," with the republics having direct access to this channel and simultaneous translation of its programs.

He concepts of "democracy," "glasnost," and "criticism and self-criticism" have gained firm currency among us and have ceased to be merely slogans. But we must not view them as goals in themselves, in isolation from practical deeds. And our task is to make these concepts, in their indissoluble unity, reliable tools in resolving the vital tasks of economic development, social policy, and the enhancement of Soviet people's well-being.

Timeliness and efficiency in fulfilling decisions are more important than ever today. For instance, the apparatus of party organs will soon have to be reduced. It is desirable to carry out this work within a short time span, to ensure no repetition of the situation that arose in connection with the reduction in the size and streamlining of the national economy's management organs. This work was dragged out, with the result that tens of thousands of people, pro tem, did practically no work.

One last point. The delegates from the Tajik party organization asked me to express our common opinion that we totally approve all the tenets of the report delivered here by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, including all the aspects of the reform of the political system. (Applause)

News Conferences on Results of Meeting Reported

Kolbin on Ethnic Issues

LD0107133688 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—"We seek to assert the principles of social justice and to raise the wellbeing of all people inhabiting our multi-ethnic republic," stated

Gennadiy Kolbin, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan. He met with journalists at the press centre of the 19th all-union party conference today.

Having recalled the dramatic events of December 1986 which led to exacerbation of nationalist sentiments in the republic, Gennadiy Kolbin said: "Since then the state of affairs in Kazakhstan has sharply changed for the better". This applies, in particular, to the economic sphere: The annual average rate of increase in national income has more than trebled as compared with the previous five-year plan period (1981-1985) to reach 4.5 percent. Housing construction surpassed the 1985 level by 35 percent. Tangible changes have also taken place in the supply of population with food.

"Perestroyka calls for a new thinking and style of work," delegate Kolbin went on to say. "We now evaluate the implementation of the housing problem not by the floor area of housing built but by a real reduction in the number of those who are in need of apartments. We associate successes of the Food Programme with the amount and diversity of foodstuffs which are on sale in shops".

The Communists of the republic, Gennadiy Kolbin emphasized, particularly cherish the strengthening of friendship between the peoples of Kazakhstan which is inhabited by Kazakhs, Russians, Ukrainians, Uigurs, Germans, Koreans, and by representatives of other nationalities. "I am confident that the problems which could have given rise to inter-ethnic friction should be resolved before they assume the character of a conflict," he said.

The republic builds theatres and schools, and publishes books and newspapers in national languages, and, what is the main thing, a respectful attitude to people is being established in the republic. The secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan told journalists that he studied the Kazakh language and it proved within his powers to render part of his speech at the latest plenary meeting in Kazakh. "We are convinced: A person should not feel embarassed owing to the fact that he belongs to a definite nation. It is this constitutional requirement that the state, party and local-government bodies, including the Supreme Soviet of Kazakhstan, are guided by now," Gennadiy Kolbin said.

Razumovskiy: Perestroyka Continues

LD0107221688 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—"It can be said with full reason that the conference has fully justified the expectations and has become an event of truly historic importance for our party and the country," said Gyorgiy Razumovskiy, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He spoke tonight at a news conference on the results of the 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU.

"The main conclusion of our forum is that perestroyka continues, that it has been given a new impetus and is being brought to a qualitatively new stage, and becomes irreversible," he said. "These have been four days of intensive, meaningful, creative work of all the 5,000 delegates to the conference, each of whom has been constantly aware of lofty responsibility for decision-making", Gyorgiy Razumovskiy said.

As it was noted at the news conference, the party forum has been concluded in adopting seven resolutions. Altogether more than 100 people spoke from the rostrum of the conference in the debates on the report of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and making amendments to the resolutions, while some 270 people registered to speak. The statements of those who have not been able to take the floor at the forum will be published. 54 million people took part in meetings of party organisations and work collectives prior to the conference. They submitted some two million proposals which have formed the basis of the mandates of the delegates to the conference and were taken into account in drafting its documents.

"Open criticism and self-criticism has become the most tangible demonstration of democratism at the conference," Gyorgiy Razumovskiy noted. "Delegates conducted a party-motivated principled talk. Quite often critical remarks were addressed to the CPSU Central Committee, to the country's government, to individual laders of ministries and agencies. The wish was manifested to find jointly the roads for overcoming difficulties and contradictions accompanying the process of perestroyka."

Moscow's Karabasov Admits Corruption

LD0107201188 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1415 GMT 1 Jul 88

[From the "Conference Diary" program]

[Text] [Announcer] You know that the work of the all-union party conference is being followed throughout the world. We have reported that and talked about it. Very many foreign correspondents have been accredited. The press center is operating from morning to evening. Today, Soviet and foreign journalists met with delegates representing the Moscow party organization.

Among them was Yuriy Sergeyevich Karabasov, secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, talking about the period of stagnation, corruption, and other negative phenomena. Responding to a question, he said:

[Begin Karabasov recording] For the Moscow party organization, the phenomena of stagnation and conservatism were, perhaps, the most difficult and deep. And it was precisely for that that the Moscow city party organization was criticized at the 27th party congress—for the first time in the history of the party and for the first time in the history of the Moscow party organization. This does not mean that some of Moscow's Communists at certain levels were not involved in unseemly affairs. Such instances exist, such instances have occurred, and we are trying, as it were, to root out all these facts. [end recording]

[Announcer] Well, there was a direct and frank conversation at the conference about the democratization of public life, the regeneration of the masses' social activity, the problems of young people, the informal associations, and the culture of discussion. Those taking part in the press conference answered many questions from journalists. [video shows Karabasov on the press center platform, addressing the journalists]

Sagdeyev on Debates

LD0107174488 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—"I believe that the proposal put forward in the report of the general secretary of the 19th all-union party conference that the post of a first secretary of a party organisation be combined at the level of the USSR Supreme Soviet", said secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU Yuriy Karabasov. He met with journalists today at the press centre of the Soviet Communists' forum.

At the same time, Yuriy Karabasov noted that applying this principle at lower levels causes doubt.

In the opinion of a delegate to the party conference, Moscow student Vitalina Trifonenko, it is necessary to advance candidates during the election of deputies to local soviets not only from industrial enterprises and public organisations, but also from individual groups of citizens and unofficial associations, including associations of young people. She is of the opinion that these measures will promote democratisation of the management of society.

Commenting on the debate at the party conference, Academician Roald Sagedeyev, director of the Institute of Space Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences, emphasized that they have an acute and principled character. He expressed satisfaction with the fact that the question of "monopolies" in the scientific and literary circles was raised at the party conference. Scientific schools of a narrow circle of scientists sprang up in the years of stagnation while writers formed in camera "clubs" at the editorial offices of journals. And members of such "monopolies" sometimes taking advantage of their membership in the CPSU, hampered free exchange of opinions and suppressed criticism. The question of eliminating such "monopolies" was raised by the party conference and it must be tackled ever more vigorously, Academician Sagdeyev said.

Answering questions if law enforcement bodies investigate cases of former high officials guilty of corruption in Moscow, Yuriy Karabasov said: "No such criminal proceedings are conducted." "This does not mean, however, that Moscow Communists have not been involved in unseemly deeds," he said.

Lukyanov: Lively Debate

LD0107222288 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—"Never before have I seen such close relationship with the people and so lively debate on the most topical issues of the country. It is perestroyka that has imparted such an impetus to the party forum, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Lukyanov told newsmen at a meeting devoted to the results of the 19th all-union party conference.

Lukyanov said that a million letters had been sent to the CPSU Central Committee since the publication of the decision of the June, 1987 plenary meeting of the party Central Committee to convene a conference.

50,000 proposals had been addressed directly to the conference.

400-500 letters, telegrams and suggestions poured in from Soviet people every day, without counting the mandates brought along by the delegates, Lukyanov pointed out.

The Central Committee received up to 400 people who came to Moscow specially to express their views and make suggestions.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary pointed out that the conference and delegates were in this way directly linked with the masses.

Figurnov on Economic Reforms

LD0107165488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Jul 88

[From the "Conference Diary" program]

[Text] At the press center of the 19th all-union party conference today, Soviet and foreign journalists met with Figurnov, chief of a branch of the economic department of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Begin recording] [Reporter S. Medvedev] The majority of the questions concerned the procedure for implementing the radical economic reform in the country. Comrade Figurnov stressed that so far the first steps have been taken, and that today only reserves which are lying on

the surface of the economy are being used—the improvement of discipline and control. The state Enterprise Law came into force only at the start of this year and is operating only at half of the enterprises. The other ones will switch to financial autonomy and self-financing on January 1989.

[Figurnov, in progress] ...of another question, about democratization it is perfectly natural that so far or today the Enterprise Law is not operating full-strength. This is due to objective conditions. And secondly, of course, there are subjective factors—that is, the unwillingness of some officials of ministries or even the inability to work in a new way.

[Medvedev] At the meeting it was noted that for the time being the democratization of the economy has not yet been implemented at the ministry level. The financial and credit system and the price-formation system also requre reform.

Answering correspondents' questions, Comrade Figurnov stressed that state orders are also not yet operating as one would like. In many enterprises they make up 100 per cent of the production program. Quite a lot has been said from the rostrum of the party conference about this, too. It is indispensable to change this situation urgently; and the criticism will be taken into account when drawing up the plans for next year. [end recording]

Rules Out Unemployment

LD0107101588 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—A radical economic reform in the USSR has made just the first steps, Evald Figurnov believes. The head of a sector of the Economic Department of the CPSU Central Committee met today with journalists accredited at the press centre of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

The most striking changes took place at the industrial enterprises that were transferred on full cost-accounting and self-financing starting from January 1, this year. Labour productivity went up there, some headway was made in improving the quality of products and in resource-saving.

The reform has been less successful so far on a branch level where the administrative apparatus often cannot or does not want to work in line with a new style, Figurnov pointed out. However, significant shifts have been made there too: A number of unnecessary ministries were eliminated, interbranch production amalgamations are being created which are given complete economic autonomy. Two such amalgamations have been created in Leningrad in the sphere of power engineering and chemical machine-building. At the same time, he continued, it would not be reasonable to dissolve ministries in the sphere of energy generation and transport where they perform coordinating functions.

Evald Figurnov shared the opinion of some delegates to the party conference that it is only preconditions for a radical economic reform that had been created in the past three years. This is why there have been no dramatic changes in Soviet economy so far. He pointed out that elements of the new economic mechanism are gradually put into action, and it will start working at its full capacity in the next five-year-plan period (1991-1995).

Answering questions, the CPSU Central Committee spokesman pointed out the importance of economic competition of industrial enterprises for overcoming stagnation phenomena. In his opinion, a socialist market cannot be formed without healthy competition.

Figurnov ruled out a possibility of unemployment in the USSR, because structural changes in the economy and the accelerated development of non-productive branches will ensure complete employment of the population.

Armenian, Azerbaijani Delegates Comment

PM0107123188 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 1 Jul 88 p 4

[Report by special correspondents K. Mezentsev, N. Pastukhov, and V. Solovyev: "Signs of the New; Reportage From 19th All-Union Party Conference Press Center"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Although it was early morning, there were many people who wanted to talk with representatives of the Armenian delegation. After all, the events which are developing around Nagorno-Karabakh have graphically shown that the years when insufficient attention was paid to the development of the nationalities policy were fraught with very acute problems and tragic consequences. G.M. Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Academician S.A. Ambartsumyan, and E.M. Dzhrbashyan answered Soviet and foreign journalists' questions directly and frankly. The situation in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast did not take shape today or yesterday, they said. The omissions allowed with regard to this region were of a social, political nature. Since that is so, seeking a solution to the problem through strong-arm methods is not the path we must travel. And, G.M. Voskanyan stressed, a decision should be found of a kind that does not violate the many centuries of friendship between the neighboring peoples.

The same topic was touched on by representatives of the Azerbaijan Communist Party speaking late that evening. S.B. Tatliyev, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, assessed highly the atmosphere of business-like party discussion which has developed at the conference. Answering questions on the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, he noted that the situation remains tense. In the estimation of the members of the Azerbaijani delegation, there is no way of resolving this problem except to consolidate the

friendship between the Armenian and Azerbaijani population. Party, soviet, and economic organs have a great and complex task in performing explanatory work among the population and stabilizing the situation. "We are undertaking contacts with the Armenian SSR leadership on this subject," S. Tatliyev said. [passage omitted]

Scholar on Conference Spirit

LD0107083788 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—"The spirit of the 19th party conference is in no way similar to the atmosphere of the congresses and conferences of the past, when the opinion of the main speaker was considered to be infallible and not for discussion. Now disputes are going on, the audience is very freely reacting to the speeches, at times openly disagreeing with the views expressed," said Academician Dmitriy Likhachev, chairman of the Board of the Soviet Cultural Foundation. He met today with newsmen at the press centre of the 19th all-union party conference.

The 82-year-old scholar noted that the evidence of the democratic character of the discussions is the fact that although he is a non-party man, he is attending the conference as a guest. "I am not the only non-party man watching the course of the forum in the Kremlin," the academician noted.

Asked by newsmen Dmitriy Likhachev said that in his view, today the main achievements of perestroyka are in the ideological field. "I have lived through so few turning points in the USSR's history and I am now pleasantly amazed at the speed, at which our country's cultural atmosphere is being restored," he said. The attempts at returning to the past—suppressing the free expression of views by all sorts of fears has no support at the party conference, the academician said.

Comparing the notion of democracy in the USSR and the West, Dmitriy Likhachev stressed that the views of the West and East on the notion of democracy are drawing closer. "The attempts at picturing Soviet democracy as a peculiar one are already unsuccessful. Unlike the Western interpretation of that notion, we only attach much significance to the aspects of democracy, which are now important to Soviet society—the attitude to believers which has now fundamentally changed, the attitude to the press and some other things," he said.

Speaking on inter-state relations in the present-day world, Academician Likhachev stressed that in the 20th century there have been ethical losses in relations between nations and nationalities. "Despite the terrible lessons of the Second World War, the peoples are yet insufficiently friendly towards one another. It is necessary to understand that the prestige of the nation lies not in military power, but in a highly moral attitude to one's own cultural values and those of other peoples.

The subject of "the moral prestige of the nations" should be a subject of discussions at international conferences, Dmitriy Likhachev believes.

Academician Likhachev is a prominent Soviet scholar in the field of the history of Russian culture. Therefore, of interest for the newsmen was his opinion about the so-called historical-patriotic society "Pamyat". Pointing out the grown interest, especially among young people, in the cultural and historical heritage, he stressed his extremely negative attitude to manifestations of nationalism. "When the society 'Pamyat' wishes to find those guilty for the blunders in the Soviet society's development only among the Jews, this in my view is a follow-up to the education of the thirties when they were trying to find 'the enemies of the people' and plotters everywhere. This is totally in conflict with the spirit of Russian intelligentsia, which has never been nationalistic," he said.

Delegates Discuss Yeltsin, Ligachev Exchange

[Editorial Report] LD01071810 Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1415 GMT on 1 July, in its "Diary of the 19th Party Conference" program, broadcasts a report on speakers at the 1 July session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow. The report begins with the announcer' statement that the conference session has now adjourned for an interval, and that commentator Aleksandr Tikhomirov is in the foyer of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses talking to some of the delegates:

The video shows Tikhomirov standing in front of a group of delegates as he says: "Yes, the interval really has just begun here after a sitting the like of which, as regards the heat generated, none of those present can probably remember. Is that right?" An unidentified delegate replies: "Yes, very acute heat. The discussion was gripping and lively, and, of course, we had not seen, or heard, anything like it for a long time." Tikhomirov asks him to identify the most interesting event of the day. The delegate then speaks about openness and says that the proposals put forward today are in accord with perestroyka. Tikhomirov chides the delegate by saying: "I think you are brilliantly evading the answer. Brilliantly!"

Another delegate then speaks in praise of openness and the fearlessness that characterized the conference. He introduces himself as Ivan Ivanovich Maksimov and then makes a few general points about the value of exchanging opinions. Pressed by Tikhomirov to be more specific, Maksimov continues:

"I, for example, want to talk about the final speeches: Yeltsin, his defenders and, in contrast, those who hold different views—especially about the latter, because I

think that today we had real controversy. Before that, we had good speeches. There were weak speeches and good ones, raising various issues. But this evening there was real controversy; that is, polemics and, in general, what there should always be in everyone."

The first delegate then comments briefly that the main thing was not the Yeltsin affair, but what delegates would take away from the conference. At this point, a third, unidentified, delegate makes the following contribution:

"Sasha [Tikhomirov], I wanted to say that I think, nevertheless, that the most important thing today for me personally was the discussion of the issue connected with Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin]. The point is that I saw him a couple of days ago. He was very agitated. He said that he had put his name down to speak but held out very little hope that he would be able to do so. To be honest, I, too, kept wondering whether we had reached a level of democratization at which we could start to discuss the question openly. And I was immensely impressed both by the fact that the Presidium gave him the floor and, especially, by the fact that Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev] forbade anyone to interrupt Yeltsin during his speech and insisted that he should be allowed to speak to the end. He rightly said: It is essential that the party should sort this matter out. What happened here is, in my view, an example of how we ought to work in the spirit of the decisions that the conference must shortly adopt."

A delegate then introduces himself as (Gvander Kaskerovich Kasinov), first secretary of Moskovskiy Raykom in North Kazakhstan Oblast. He tells Tikhomirov: "Well, the multiplicity of views goes without saying. But the debate reached its most heated moments after Comrade Yeltsin's speech. If anyone in the West has an obsession about it following his interview, then all that should be over now. This is because a rebuff was delivered here, a truly political battle was engaged. As for the outcome of the statements—when I arrived I did not know about all this. We only knew the rumors, about which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev today said: 'There must be clarity on this matter.' This matter was made clear and accurate for me. Yeltsin is politically wrong. I would say that today the blame lies with Yeltsin. The questions that people raised after the debate had ended, when the general secretary gave free access, he did not stop what was going on...."

Tikhomirov then interrupts him to say: "Yet it must be stressed that different opinions were expressed. A Sverdlovsk delegate spoke in defense of Yeltsin. Then there was a speech by Nikolay Sergeyevich Chirkirev, director of the Ordzhonikidze works, who accused Yeltsin."

Another delegate then introduces himself as (Ramitsyn), from the Odessa delegation. He says: "It is difficult for me to say who is right and who is wrong. That is because we are absolutely ignorant of the viewpoint expressed by Yeltsin at the plenum. It has not been published. It is referred to in a whisper. It is mainly Muscovites who...." At this point, presenter Aleksandr Krutov interrupts to say: "Excuse me, let me interrupt. Yegor Kuzmich [Ligachev] did say that the gist of Boris Nikolayevich's [Yeltsin's] speech at the October plenum was set out in his speech today."

(Ramitsyn) replies: "Well, if what he said here is anything to go by, he is half right. We say the same things." Another delegate, unidentified, interjects: "He went further in what he said today than he did at the October plenum."

An unidentified delegate breaks in to say: "I think that if we knew what was in Comrade Yeltsin's first speech, we could understand this issue in greater depth." To which Tikhomirov responds: "In other words, we return to the statement already made by a speaker from the rostrum to the effect that, as he put it, it was a mistake on the part of the Central Committee that Yeltsin's speech at the October Plenum was not published." The same delegate replies: "Yes, we need deep-going glasnost. Then perhaps such questions would not arise."

Another unidentified delegate, interviewed by Tikhomirov, says: "My position is quite clear. I can say with certainty that to bear a grudge for a whole year and then to make demands again today—I believe that a party leader at this level should not behave like this. He can see what is happening in the party and on the international scene. This is a very important matter of principle. In the petty detail and fine phrases you have to discern the basis of it all. It is something you have to know to understand. I am a party worker, and such people are very familiar to me. They are driven by ambition, by strong ambition. And this is a very dangerous phenomenon."

An unidentified woman delegate says: "You know, I witnessed the October plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. I believe that people have simply got it wrong here. Of course, I back the truth; I back Gorbachev. But I believe that what Comrade Yeltsin said should have been published. People are getting it wrong here, and that is why they regard him as a hero."

2 Jul News Conferences Continue To View Session

Razumovskiy, Lukyanov on Resolutions

LD0207171588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 2 Jul 88

[Report on 2 July news conference given by Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, held in the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference press center; presented by correspondent Vladimir Nazarov—remarks by Razumovskiy and Lukyanov recorded]

[Text] [Nazarov] Attending the news conference were Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and

secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo, opened the news conference with general remarks:

[Razumovskiy] As people who participated directly in the conference we would like to stress that we continually sensed the great responsibility borne by each person for the elaboration of its decisions. A high level of activity was characteristic both of the number who put their names down—around 300—and the number who spoke. Among those who participated in the deliberations were 29 party workers; 7 managers of enterprises, associations, collective and state farms; 12 workers, collective farm workers, and specialists; 17 representatives of various categories of the intelligentsia; and 7 senior officials of ministries, departments, trade unions, and Komsomol, and other mass organizations. Several special commissions involving around 500 delegates were formed to draw up draft resolutions for the conference. These commissions worked hard every day, both before the sittings and after the sittings, and deep into the night. Taking part in the discussions of the draft resolutions before they were presented at this evening's concluding sitting, or should I say tonight, were 150 people. Those drafts were distributed to the delegates, who were able in advance, 2 days before the resolutions were adopted [pauses]... virtually all of the 5,000 delegates had the opportunity of participating directly in preparing the final versions which were eventually adopted.

Already one has every reason to say that the conference justified the expectations placed on it, and was an event of truly enormous historic significance for our party and for our country. It both enriched strategy and provided concrete substance to the tactics of restructuring, and determined the ways, forms, and methods in which the party should operate under contemporary conditions. The main political outcome of the conference is that it lent authoritative support to the bold and innovative program for intensifying the restructuring which was presented to the conference by the party Central Committee. The delegates' speeches, the conference documents, and the concept of reform of our political system which they underlie, vividly demonstrated the Soviet Communists' commitment to fundamental socialist values, and their firm desire for a qualitative and revolutionary renewal of socialism with due consideration for domestic and international realities. The restructuring goes on. It is gaining a second lease on life, rising to a qualitatively new level and becoming irreversible. There is a guarantee of this, for the documents adopted today finally put everything in place.

It is also worth mentioning that many delegations arrived with specific instructions from Communists and nonparty members, and with detailed proposals on the whole range of issues under discussion, which they advocated in debates or the working bodies of the conference and the commissions preparing resolutions. The conference deemed it necessary that all the proposals contained in instructions brought by delegations and in delegates' speeches be generalized, that they be considered in the work of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and local party and soviet bodies, and that Communists and all working people of our country be widely informed of the results of the consideration given to these matters and the measures that were adopted.

Much of what the delegates proposed was reflected in the conference's final documents. For instance, on a proposal from delegate Ironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, the general political resolution included a special point about the party's youth policy.

[Nazarov] All the journalists were interested in the final documents of the conference. A comment on these documents was made by Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Razumovskiy] The basic resolutions were on the progress of the implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and tasks of deepening restructuring, the democratization of Soviet society and the reform of the political system. Resolutions were also adopted on the struggle against bureaucratism, relations between nationalities, on glasnost, and legal reform.

What was unanimously supported? The fact that the party has taken the right line toward the further democratization of its intraparty life; that the party must focus its attention above all on the political back-up for restructuring; the party must occupy itself with its business; and the party must act by political methods, by methods of persuasion, and eliminate all other ways, above all those which have been used, like methods of administrative pressure and directives. The role and functions of party committees were unequivocally defined.

[Nazarov] How will the role of the party now change in connection with the adoption of the documents of the 19th party conference. This question was answered by Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Razumovskiy] In allocating itself the role of just the political leader, the party has proclaimed the special role of the soviets of people's deputies and their sovereignty. And in these circumstances the executive bodies must be accountable to the corps of deputies; they must be accountable to the deputies, they must be accountable to higher bodies—the soviets of people's deputies. And to ensure that this is not done in a formal way, it has been deemed desirable to have presidiums capable of truly

organizing the work of the standing commissions, organizing everything, starting with the appointment of individual leaders to executive bodies of power, going through to the deputies' commissions. And they will monitor the work of individual services. And in order that they may make themselves accountable—by themselves I mean leaders of party bodies, party committees—not only in party committees, in corporate elective party bodies, but also in representative bodies of power, the conference deemed it desirable, as a rule, to recommend the leaders of party committees to the post of chairman of the soviets of people's deputies.

[Nazarov] Following the party conference decisions, much will now be changed in the work of the soviets. How will this occur, and what specific changes will be made to the work of the soviets? This question is answered by Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy:

[Razumovskiy] Today, the leader of a party committee—as a rule, the first [as heard]—is a member of the executive body. Sometimes he even zealously ensures that no criticism is made of that executive body, because he takes part in the sittings, because he is a member of the executive committee. And it turns out that the deputies, particularly since they assemble only periodically for brief sessions, in fact acquaint themselves with decisions which have already been adopted. This issue has now been formulated as follows: Party leaders at all levels must be elected deputies of the soviet, and the electoral system will undergo considerable changes. I wish to stress this. All manner of formalities are ruled out: Beginning with the regular report-back and election campaign, which begins in literally 2 months' time, the party committee secretary will now be elected at an appropriate sitting of the party committee by secret ballot, and with alternative candidates coming under scrutiny. At a session of the corresponding soviet of people's deputies he must be elected chairman of the soviet by secret ballot. As we see it, this is where democracy lies, for if the deputies fail to support the candidate then the party committee will have to define its position. This is what the party committee secretary will have to go through in order to head the soviet, the presidium of which does not have the powers to hear reports by the executive committee. It merely organizes the deputies' work. This part of the resolution was put to the vote separately: An absolute majority was in favor of such an approach, with 209 delegates voting against work of the soviets being restructured.

[Nazarov] And what is the mechanism of this restructuring? The first to answer this question is Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with some complementary remarks from Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy.

[Lukyanov] Party bodies will make recommendations within the framework of the Constitution. At the next session—we're having a session sometime around November—we will have to alter the legislation and the construction, make amendments to the Constitution. On that basis deputies will be elected to the USSR soviets of people's deputies, and the matter will be decided first at a session of the Supreme Soviet, and then at sessions of the supreme soviets of the union republics and the local soviets. There will be restructuring.

[Razumovskiy] The time frames were mentioned by Mikhail Sergeyevich: the Supreme Soviet will be in the spring.

[Lukyanov] April.

[Razumovskiy] April 1989, and the local soviet elections in the autumn of next year. [as heard]

[Nazarov] What is the last and final formulation of the point on the length of term of the election of the first secretary, in short, the leader of the party organisation? Here is what Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskii said in reply to the question:

[Razumovskiy] Not one person in the party or the state can be elected for more than two terms in a row—that is, not for more than 10 years. As for the election of first secretaries, the leaders of party committees, to posts in the soviets, this is being extended to all party committees without exception, starting from the rayon party committee and ending with the Central Committee of the party, with the general secretary.

[Nazarov] A question from an American journalist. If a party leader is not elected to the post of chairman of some soviet of working people's deputies, what will happen? Here is the reply for Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Lukyanov] The party committee should discuss the reasons for such an approach. As for the election of the chairman, this matter can be reviewed in the most democratic way, with one, two, or three candidates, or as many as you like. [6-minute musical interlude]

[Nazarov] A French journalist asked how the proposal had arisen about combining the posts of party and soviet leader. For this proposal was not contained in the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee to the conference. Here is the reply:

[Lukyanov] Of course, we studied the experience of the congresses of soviets in the period of Lenin. We recieved rather a lot of letters. But the most important progress in resolving this question took place at Comrade Gorbachev's meetings with the first secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the union republics, obkoms, and kraykoms. This was reported in our press. This question arose then, and this idea was gradually crystalized. As it was still being discussed it could not immediately be reflected in the Theses.

[Nazarov] As is known, on some points of the party conference resolutions, for the first time in a long time there were abstentions and delegates who voted against. Here is a question from a foreign journalists: How was the vote counting implemented?

[Razumovskiy] The absolute majority of the resolutions were adopted by open voting. This took place in a hall containing 5,000 delegates. Therefore, to carry out the counting, comrades were specially designated from among the delegates to each sector; they could communicate with each other. Every vote was accounted for. I have already spoken of the results of the voting. Only on two points—considerable ones, so to say—when it was a matter of the formulation concerning the recommendation of first secretaries of party committees as chairmen of the relevant soviets, and yet another question particularly touched upon an aspect which also had to be put separately to a vote as a point of the resolution, on how to elect secretaries of party committees. A vote was taken on what was proposed in the resolution: to elect the secretary of the party committee from the membership of the elective body by secret voting, as proposed in the draft resolution; and on the proposal of those comrades who insisted on direct elections of all Communists, conference delegates. They received 145 votes.

[Nazarov] What are the functions of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This was of interest to all the journalists present at this news conference.

[Lukyanov] The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet will head the work on major draft laws, major programs of economic and social development; he will work on resolving major international questions, he will represent our country abroad, and will be chairman of the country's Defense Council. At the same time he will head the work of the Supreme Soviet, and coordinate the work of standing commissions, as he will be a member of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. His Supreme Soviet presidium is also the coordinating body, the organizing, representative body of deputies. It will consist of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, his first deputy, another first deputy—the chairman of the USSR Peoples Control Committee—15 deputies, in accordance with the number of union republics. We have always had 15, as we have 15 union republics. It will also consist of the chairmen of the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet, and finally of the chairmen of the commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet.

A body is being created which will organize the work of the deputies, the corps of deputies, which will maintain checks on the executive power.

Conference Results Discussed

LD0207211488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1415 GMT 2 Jul 88

[From the "Conference Diary" program; news conference held on 2 July in the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference Press Center by Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chaired by Yuriy Aleksandrovich Sklyarov, director of the press center and head of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department—recorded; accompanying video shows Lukyanov, Razumovskiy, and Sklyarov seated at a table facing journalists]

[Text] [Razumovskiy] We now have behind us 4 days of intensive and exceptionally full and substantive creative work by all the delegates, and as direct participants of the conference we would like to stress that throughout we felt the very high responsibility of each person for the drawing up of its decisions. It has been stated that a high level of activity was characteristic both of the number who put their names down—about 300—and the number who spoke. One can specify the categories of those who spoke, which is obviously of some interest. Among those who participated in the deliberations were 29 party workers; 7 managers of enterprises, associations, kolkhozes and sovkhozes; 12 workers, kolkhoze workers, and specialists; 17 representatives of various categories of the intelligentsia; and 7 senior officials of ministries, departments, trade unions, the Komsomol, and other mass organizations. Several special commissions involving around 500 delegates were set up to draft resolutions for the conference. These commission worked hard every day, both before the sittings and after the sittings, and deep into the night. The intensity of the work in the commissions themselves may be judged by the number of people directly involved in the drafting, and who spoke and submitted various proposals. One hundred and fifty people took part in discussing the draft resolutions before they were presented at the concluding session.

The drafts were distributed to the delegates, who were able in advance, 2 days before the resolutions were adopted [pauses]... virtually all the 5,000 delegates had the opportunity of participating directly in preparing the final versions, which were eventually adopted. Already one has every reason to say that the conference justified the expectations placed on it, and was an event of truly enormous historic significance for our party and our country.

The conference was prepared by the whole party in a setting of unprecedented public activity, not just on the part of Communists, but on the part of nonparty people. Suffice it to say that 54 million people took part in meetings that discussed the CPSU Central Committee Theses, and of this number 6.6 million people spoke. About 2 million proposals were submitted. These proposals comprised the basis of the mandates of the conference delegates. They were generalized and taken into account in the preparation of the documents that were being drawn up. In continuing on this theme, I would particularly note that the success of the conference was facilitated in a decisive way by its business-like character, which was free of any pretence or empty talk. The tone here was set by the report of the CPSU Central Committee, which was delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. All this determined to a great extent the

constructiveness and high political tension of the debates at the conference, the pointed posing of urgent problems, and the boldness of the conclusions drawn from their analysis.

By the way, the delegates—without much ceremony—put a stop to relapses of those diseases of stagnation, the offering of accounts of one's own activities instead of sticking to the agenda, or going off into empty logomachy. And some of the speakers had rather a hard time on the platform. The discussion itself was very lively and frank, and free from overregulation. There were no previously prepared lists of speakers, or arranged and coordinated texts of speeches. Those who did not have time to speak handed the texts of their speeches to the Secretariat, and they will be included in the stenographic record.

Another thing worth noting is that many delegations came with specific requests from Communists and nonparty members, and with detailed proposals on the whole range of issues discussed. These they submitted to the Secretariat of the conference, and defended in the debates or in the working bodies of the conference and in the commissions preparing the resolutions. The conference deemed it necessary to draw general conclusions from all the proposals contained in the mandates and the speeches of the delegations, and to take account of them in the work of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the local party and soviet bodies; and also to inform the Communists and all the working people of our country extensively of the results of the examination of these issues, and of the measures taken. Much of what the delegates proposed has been reflected in the conference final documents.

That the conference thought it necessary to adopt special resolutions precisely on the issues that were the center of the discussion, is logical. This in fact restores a practice that existed in Lenin's time. The final documents of the conference sum up the conclusions that the delegates reached after detailed discussion. Thirty-one people expressed a desire to speak in the course of discussion of these documents.

[Lukyanov] I'd like to draw your attention to one detail that has been very much a feature of our conference. It is the very close link with the people, with the masses. After the June plenum, the decision to convene this conference was published, and the Central Committee received a million letters—a million letters on these issues. And 50,000 suggestions of various kinds were addressed directly to the conference. We had a situation whereby 4-500 letters, telegrams, and proposals from citizens addressed to the conference were coming in every day, and that does not include the mandates that the delegations brought with them. In addition, a large number of people were received at the party Central Committee who had come to tell us their opinions, share their impressions, or raise various questions.

Up to 400 people per day were also received. Thus the delegates themselves—and the conference itself—were directly connected with the population. It is not the first time that Georgiy Petrovich and I have been at such forums, and I can tell you that never before have we seen such a very close link with the people, or such an animated discussion of the most topical issues in the country's life. In this way the conference was very different indeed from our other forums.

[ASSOCIATED PRESS correspondent, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation] Several questions from the ASSOCIATED PRESS. Could you give specific figures for the voting on the seven resolutions. Was the voting carried out by secret ballot, or, as usual, by raising cards?

[Razumovskiy] First, about 500 delegates at the conference worked for 4 days on drawing up and preparing all the resolutions. Alongside this 150 people made speeches and submitted amendments. Second, 65-70 people made speeches—and these are probably not the full figures because they took the floor for 1-2 minutes, and sometimes the comrades made speeches at the end of the session. And even during the discussion of the resolutions 31 people came to the rostrum at the plenary session. Every person was able to work with the document, the draft, discuss with his delegation, consult with his comrades. And it was often stressed by those making speeches that the comrade that took the floor, wishing to submit some kind of addition, change or comment, was submitting it not only for himself personally, but also from those that he had consulted with. Therefore, we believe that the circle of participants here was so great that it is difficult even to surmise the name accurately. To all intents and purposes all the delegates took part.

As regards the resolutions, how were they adopted? I have told you that the resoluitons were adopted by an absolute, overwhelming majority, by open voting. Imagine that this took place in a hall containing 5,000 delegates. Therefore, comrades to carry out the counting were specially designated from among the delegates to each sector. Every vote was accounted, as was every mandate that was raised, either for or against.

[Lukyanov] Or abstentions.

[Razumovskiy] Or abstentions. the results of the voting were as follows: 209 delegates voted against, out of let's say 5,000, when what was at stake was the formulation on recommending first secretaries of party committes as chairmen of the corresponding local soviets. And another question touched particularly many people, an item that also had to be put to a vote separately, as a point, a resolution. During the conference there was discussion of the question of how to elect secretaries of party committees. There was a vote on a proposal in a resolution to elect the secretary of a party committee from the composition of an elected organ by secret

ballot, as was proposed in the draft resolution, and the proposal of those comrades who insisted on direct elections of all Communists or conference delegates. They received 145 votes.

[Lukyanov] Out of 5,000.

[Razumovskiy] There is a question I would like to answer: Tell us please about the guests who were present at the conference. How many were there, who were they, and what were the criteria for deciding to invite them?

Perhaps you, as observant people, notice right at the opening of the conference that even the composition of the Presidium was much less than, let's say, at the party congress and other events that are held in this palace. This time foreign guests were not invited. The work of the conference was set to be business-like and to work without any sort of solemnities whatsoever. As for the people who were invited, they were various categories of workers, primarily those representing public organizations, creative unions, science, front-ranking workers from Moscow—the leaders of the mass media were quite widely represented—and periodically the guests were changed from among Muscovites, primarily Muscovites, changed on a daily basis so that during the conference there were several thousand people present as guests.

Dobrynin Meets With Press

LD0207192088 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 2 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—A meeting between Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and representatives of the working-class and democratic press who covered the 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU was held today.

Taking part in the meeting were more than a hundred correspondents of newspapers and magazines published in 67 non-socialist countries by communist, revolutionary democratic, socialist, social democratic, labour and other progressive parties.

In his introductory speech Anatoliy Dobrynin specially emphasized the importance of the conference as an epochal event in the history of the CPSU and the Land of the Soviets. "Held in the Leninist style, it signifies a landmark which ushers in a new stage of perestroyka, a stage of qualitative changes in all its directions and first of all in a particularly important one—political".

"The preparation and holding of the party conference were marked truly by an outburst of political activity in our country. On the days of the conference and particularly on the final day when everyone was looking forward to its decisions and results, there were no indifferent people. And such an immense interest is understandable, for the conference discussed the issues which affect the destiny of every citizen of our country irrespective of whether he is a Communist Party member or a non-party person".

"By its style and its very form and content the conference signified the revival of Leninist demands on party forums of this type. Really, this party conference is something new which has gone beyond the customary framework of the already established practice. By its emotional intensity, openness of judgements, and boldness of criticism, this was as if a great lesson of democracy when delegates were learning to argue in a civilised way, to combine interest with tolerance and the ability to listen to the arguments of the opposing side. The search for reasonable solutions acceptable to everyone was under way".

"Unlike the past periods of over organization, there was nothing of the kind at this party conference. There was a tremendous interest at this party conference. There was a tremendous interest of its participants and their literally unprecedented activity. One should only see with what ardour the resolutions were discussed at the plenary session and how delegates introduced one amendment and addition after another upholding them. In short, that was perestroyka of our party life in action, an illustration of the political maturity, strength and democratic nature of our party".

Then Anatoliy Dobrynin touched upon the substance of the issues discussed by the conference. An aggregate evaluation of its importance was made in Mikhail Gorbachev's closing speech. "The chief result of the conference's work is that a programmatic political position has been worked out on all fundamental issues which had been the subject of party-wide and country-wide discussion. The conference focussed its attention on the question of the role of the party as political vanguard, as a political force which exercises guidance over perestroyka. This has the most direct bearing on radical restructuring of all its activities, style, ways, forms and methods of work of all its elements and at all levels".

This has been, is and remains the main guideline of the party's leadership. Clearly, the methods and means of its implementation should be adequate to the goal. In practical terms this means taking counsel with the whole people, with the whole party, not confining ourselves to armchair practices in elaborating fine decisions, but involving the whole party, the whole intellectual potential of the people in drawing it up, and organically blending the aims and methods of democratisation.

We have been, are and will remain a party of action, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said. Our current platform for actions has been determined by the decisions of the conference. They have been spelled out in several resolutions, which cover in some or other way all fields of the society's life.

Decisions have been taken on a fundamental change of the whole of our political system. Their significance also consists in the fact that the political structure of one of the world's biggest states will change. A group of the conference's decisions is aimed at effectivley carrying out the economic reform, at accelerating it. The point at issue are the most urgent tasks, which are to be promptly decided already today to be implemented tomorrow, and the long-term ones, which are in need of further consideration, specification and detailed elaboration.

It can be said that if not tomorrow, then the day after tomorrow we will be entering the particularly important stage of implementation of these decisions. How will that be happening?—in different ways.

In the first place, this concerns the decisions of inter-party life. They will be implemented already this year, in the course of the report and election campaigns at party organisations to be held this autumn. These elections will be held in accordance with the norms and procedures endorsed by the party conference.

Second, some of our general decisions of principle, will become a subject of further discussion and specification at the party Central Committee. Thus the question of inter-ethnic relations will be examined at a plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee.

Third, a number of decisions in the nature of recommendations, of party views, necessitate a discussion at the bodies of Soviet Government. In particular, as far as the reorganisation of the soviets is concerned, the whole package of issues in that connection is to be examined at the autumn session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We also proceed from the premise that the Congress of People's Deputies will be held in April 1989 to form new bodies of government. The elections to the republican and local councils and the formation of the corresponding leading bodies will be held in the autumn of 1989.

In the fourth place, some decisions, as, for example, of a judiciary reform will necessitate special legal expert examination, the preparation of the respective draft laws, then their discussion by the whole people and sealing in the legislative acts of the plenipotentiary authorities.

Fifth, it will take special time and special procedures to adopt respective legislative acts, including making substantive amendments to the Constitution of the USSR and the constitutions of the union republics.

Certain changes will also be required in the CPSU rules, but that will, probably, be done already at the 28th congress of our party. "The delegates will now return to their party organizations. A widespread discussion of the results of the conference and, what is the main thing, the implementation of its decisions will begin. A comradely exchange of opinions and a collective search for optimum ways of perestroyka being conducted on the basis of socialist values make it possible to take into account the entire spectrum of the interests of society and of its various groups and to mobilise the intellectual potential of the entire party and all people. Therefore we do not dramatise the fact that arguments assume at times a rather acute character. We believe in the common sense of the people, a majority of Soviet people. If wrong, unacceptable views are expressed, we shall engage in a well-reasoned polemic to convince people and explain things".

Judging by data which have already come in, the work of the conference and the decisions adopted by it have roused a powerful response abroad. We do not yet know in detail evaluations being given in progressive, democratic media but on the whole we feel a great and well-wishing interest and feel support for and solidarity with the great cause which we have embarked upon".

"Attitudes to this or that aspect of the new stage of perestroyka will probably be, as before, varied and non-uniform in some respects. And there will be discussions and arguments. We ourselves, as our guests could see for themselves, engage in lots of discussions. This is how it will be in future as well: The pluralism of opinions is an inalienable property of the started process of democratisation of the party and society".

"It is natural that with regard to perestroyka, to this or that aspect of it, there may arise questions among both foreign communists, socialists and social democrats and representatives of other parties, movements and organizations with which we maintain relations. This is quite natural and we are prepared to discuss such questions in a comradely way".

At the end of his speech Anatoliy Dobrynin touched upon the portion of the main resolution of the conference "On Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the Tasks of Deepening Perestroyka" which dealt with international affairs. "It specially emphasizes that the conference reaffirms the course of the CPSU towards invariable solidarity with the struggle of the communist and workers' parties for peace and social progress, for freedom and democracy".

"The new political thinking which has been adopted as the basis of our international activities contributes to strengthening the CPSU's contacts with the parties and organizations of the international working-class and democratic movement and with various segments of the world progressive and peace-loving public the tremendous potential of which makes it possible to count on a political solution to the problems facing mankind".

Then Anatoliy Dobrynin answered numerous questions put by journalists. They displayed a great interest in the practical aspects of the process of democratisation of Soviet society and a reform of the political system, the role of glasnost, and the place of mass media in further development of Soviet society.

Many questions concerned further development of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union within the context of the results of the conference, specifically with regard to the concept of a common European home, the USSR's stand on issues concerning the Middle East, Latin America and Africa, and the CPSU's principled approach to the national liberation movements and problems of the developing countries or contacts with the parties which are members of the Socialist International. The international aspects of perestroyka in the USSR were touched upon as well.

Medvedev Briefs Bloc Journalists

LD0207144688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 2 Jul 88

[Text] Comrade Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committe, today received a group of special correspondents from the press organs of the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries, who have been in Moscow to cover the work of the 19th all-union party conference. Taking part in the meeting were comrades from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, China, the DPRK, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia. The talk focused on the results of the conference that has just finished. Comrade Medvedev expressed gratitude to the representatives of the mass media for their attention to coverage of the work of the conference and answered journalists' questions.

Conference Delegates Comment on Outcome

Doubts Assuaged

LD0507154988 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 5 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—What has the conference changed in your views of glasnost and democratisation in the party and the society? was one of the questions in the questionnaire which the delegates to the party forum answered at the request of TASS correspondents. Today the answers have already come back to the work collectives and party organisations.

I had occasion to participate in several highest party forums of this country, said Lev Knyazkov, first secretary of the Kirovo-Chepetsk party city committee. Yet I can confidently say that it was for the first time that the final decisions of the conference depended also on my opinion as a delegate.

I believe that the very atmosphere of frank, unprejudiced dialogue clearing the soul and mind, to which the whole country looked forward, will make us look in a new way at the whole of our activities, at our own selves, said Vasiliy Mokovozov, a steel maker from Volgograd, sharing his impressions. I liked the businesslike atmosphere of the conference. It differed very much from the atmosphere of pomp, which reigned here six years ago at the 19th congress of the Young Communist League, whose delegate I was. Leaving Moscow I am firmly confident that we Communists will never permit a repetition of the times of stagnation and window-dressing.

And now follows the opinion of Nikolay Zhuravlev, chairman of the Board of the Archangelsk regional writers' organization, a delegate from Archangelsk: Before the opening of the conference many of my fellow writers and myself were, to be frank, not quite sure that the process of perestroyka is irreversible. The main guarantees of the irreversibility, glasnost and democratisation—were only gaining momentum. At the same time they more often than not proved to be unprotected by laws. The report delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev, who opened the debate, and then the frank debate, which unfolded in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, convinced us that there is no return to the times before perestroyka.

Mikhail Gorbachev described glasnost as one of the main highlights of the conference; the spectrum of the attitudes to it is quite broad. Glasnost should have its limits and it is necessary to heighten responsibility for unfounded statements, believes Vyacheslav Zarubin, second secretary of the Voronezh regional party committee.

I had doubts before the conference. It seemed to me that there were some negative phenomena, which the Central Committee was concealing from us, the Communists, admits Vladimir Vasilchenko, director of the state pedigree stock farm Shebalinskiy, a delegate from the Rostov region. Now the degree of openness and acuteness of the debate of the party's forum has dispelled all doubt.

How do you visualise the functioning of such a mechanism in your region? was the second question in the questionnaire. The need for such a mechanism for an analysis of public opinion was substantiated by Boris Isayev, chairman of the Chelyabinsk regional executive committee. People wish to judge all things independently, he believes. And do that not only when the train is already gone and nothing can be corrected, but also at the stage of the formation of the designs and projects of party, state and economic decisions. Such practices already exist, yet they do not cover all things.

This view is shared also by Valeriy Meshcheryakov, director of the Kiritsy state farm of the Ryazan region. It is necessary to give up any decisionmaking in camera in discussing any task of the region or a work collective, he stressed. And in endorsing the most important trends in the development it is necessary to hold a referendum.

Aleksandr Oblivin, rector of Moscow's Forestry Engineering Institute, believes that there is no sense to set up any new mechanism. It already exists in the form of the meetings of work collectives, meetings of city activists and sessions of soviets. It is necessary only to invigorate these forms.

The pollees single out the role of the press in that effort. "The voice of the press shall not be muffled," stressed Klavdaya Yaroslavtseva, secondary school teacher from the Tuva autonomous region. "We know too well where that leads. But the press should display responsibility in its functioning, not to uphold some or other positions or groups, but to enable everybody to speak out, to demonstrate the whole broad spectrum of views."

"What was the main lesson learnt by you from the difficulties involved in the implementation of perestroyka?" This question also caused interesting reflections by the delegates. We will cite a few excerpts from questionnaires.

"The most difficult thing was to convince people of irreversibility of perestroyka. People no longer believe just words. Now popular trust is being restored." (Pavel Pavlov, chairman of the Rossiya collective farm in the Kuibyshev region.)

"There shall be no retreat on a single principle of perestroyka. It is first and foremost necessary to get rid oneself and help other people get rid of conservative views in mind and soul." (Valery Meshcheryakov, director of the state farm "Kiritsiy" of the Ryazan region). Answering the question what ways the delegates saw towards enhancing the role of the soviets, ensuring their full powers, everybody of them stressed the need for giving the soviets effective economic and legal levers. "Those who control the material resources shall also have real powers," said Boris Isayev, chairman of the Chelyabinsk Regional Executive Committee. "The local soviets often turn into beggers going for help to plants. It is necessary to ensure that they can themselves form their budgets and, hence, resolve with competence all questions pertaining to life support in the territories."

Here is the opinion of Yevdokiya Bytrikaya, a delegate from the Krasnodar region, team leader of the plant growing team of the state farm Novomikhailovskiy: "Convenient plots in the area of the Black Sea coast are given out for construction of departmental holiday homes, while collective and state farms are forced to climb high mountains and work forest plots. Understandably, holiday hotels and tourist centres are necessary. Yet in choosing a place for them, it is necessary to take counsel with the local bodies of power."

Follows an answer to the question: "There must be one master in the north—the soviets. They should concentrate in their hands the funds, the building-technological resources and be simultaneously the clients and representatives of the State Quality Control (Gospriemka). It is also necessary to determine the way the budget of the local soviets is formed. Their activities should be materially substantiated." The conference has closed, but the discussions on the ways of our society's development are continuing. At its meeting on July 1, the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee drew special attention that all the party, soviet, and governmental bodies and public organisations should act already now, without any orders, without delay and start the implementation of the decisions of the party conference which are linked with day-to-day requests of the Soviet people, satisfy the urgent needs of the population, taking all possible care that the living standards of the people improve.

Kabaidze Comments

PM0507110188 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 26, 27 Jun-3 Jul 88 (Signed to Press 29 Jun 88) p 2

[Comments by 19th All-Union CPSU Conference delegates under general heading: "Delegates Have the Floor"]

[Excerpt] Dismantling Delay Mechanism; Vladimir Kabaidze, General Director of the Ivanovo Machine Tool Building Association Named for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR [subhead]

The time has come to demolish the bastions of instructions of the stagnation period; otherwise, the dulling of radical economic reforms is inevitable. The main administrations in ministries have been abolished (for instance, we are really in need only of the supply department of the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry). It would seem to be a good thing; henceforth, I, the enterprise leader, am directly subordinate to my minister. But we have calculated that the number of circulars and instructions has increased by no more and no less than 10 percent! But why do we need them? After all, we know where we are going and what we want. That is why we demand real autonomy, not autonomy on paper. But this will affect the interests of the apparatus based on administrative commands in which, let me note, no one now states: "I am against restructuring!" No, everyone is resolutely "for!" Yet 18 million managers of various kinds lived in clover before restructuring and continue to do so, despite all the talk about reducing and reforming the management mechanism. Extraordinary, resolute measures are needed! So far we "get hold" of everything, right down to bolts and screws, through Gosplan, Gossnab, and the sectorial ministry. This system keeps us on the shortest of leashes.

Remember the classic slogan of Brezhnev's time: "Not a single bystander!"? Those posters have been removed from the crossroads, but what is actually happening? Yes, we have switched to so-called self-financing. Why "so-called?" Under the long-term economic normative, our association has started to be left with 10 percent less funds than before. Where does our money go? It goes to keep outsider enterprises "afloat" at our expense. One and all have denounced this leveling down, and nonetheless, it is still a complete dead end.

No, I have not been transformed from an active fighter for restructuring into an opponent of restructuring and a pessimist. But it is deliberately that I am speaking directly and sharply of the bottlenecks in order to shake

up those who judge reforms from the pages of newspapers and from television and radio broadcasts. It is true that "first there was the word." But there have been too many words in support of restructuring. Exclusively specific deeds are needed now, and this is a good time for them. At all levels you are being heeded (people no longer shout, no longer slam the double doors of the bosses' offices shut in front of your nose) and are being helped more often. But I am in a hurry—to find time to do more, I am trying to push through a mass of innovations (for instance, at our own responsibility and risk, we have embarked on the production of miniature machine tools for instrument builders). I am merely sorry that I am over 60 years old. Ah, if only now, in the era of restructuring, I could knock off a dozen years...

So That Democracy Becomes the Norm; Kirill Lavrov, Chairman of the USSR Theatrical Figures' Union and People's Artist of the USSR [subhead]

In my view the most important, the most crucial task of these days is the creation of guarantees that our children will not experience what befell us. The creation of a mechanism which will make it possible in the future to rule out violations of the Leninist principles of party leadership of society. That our present euphoria does not turn into a merely temporary joy. That democracy becomes the norm, the law of the life of our society.

Many examples are known where the procedure for nominating candidates and electing delegates to the present party conference were the same as 10 years ago: Competition and collegiality were lacking, and the "schedule of allocations" triumphed. We again came up against the methods of yesterday and the day before yesterday used by those who take cover under talk of democracy and glasnost and engage in the facile painting over of the old facade. The watershed between the supporters and opponents of restructuring passes right here: It is the conflict between the champions of in-depth changes and those who like a merely cosmetic repair. Preparation for the party conference has revealed our weakness on precisely these issues: in the sphere of appointment through election and party democracy.

Spiritual progress also depends on the enhancement of the role of the creative intelligentsia in the humanization of society. I travel around the country a lot; in the republics, the resistance to the creative unions is still strong, and the prevailing attitude is that of the principle of giving culture only whatever is left over. Theatrical art is the ideology whose importance has been underrated by our society, which has led to grave moral and political consequences. The process of society's political awakening has now begun. Art should support the growth of public consciousness, should not divert, should not serve, but, as the CPSU Central Committee Theses said, should promote people's intellectual and moral improvement and the education of the individual's civic qualities.

For Leninist Economic Accountability! Valentina Gavrilyuk, Economist at the Vologda "Severnaya Chern" Plant of the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems [subhead]

Does it not seem to you that the word "economic accountability" [khozraschet] has become too popular? It is readily uttered, sometimes without looking into its meaning. It has been introduced here; such and such an effect has been obtained there...! But if you look deep down, we have virtually no economic accountability in its true, Leninist sense; we are merely on the approaches to it. An example is our plant, which seems to be run on the basis of economic accountability but—here is the paradox—the collective which itself earns the money for its own maintenance is not interested in increasing its revenue. The reason? The draconian normatives for deductions from profit set by the ministry. What kind of economical accountability is it when there is no incentive to earn more?

This is explained by the desire for show, by insufficient economic competence, and, finally, by the ministries' reluctance to abandon the diktat to which they are accustomed. They try to introduce economic accountability within the framework of the existing production structure based on administrative commands. This structure contradicts the very essence of economic accountability. Without the democratization of management, we will not advance matters from a standstill.

The democratization of management means the restriction of centralization and the granting of more independence to enterprises, primarily in their mutual relations with the market. It is time to stop stifling enterprises with state orders and stringent normatives. The sphere of activity of the labor collectives' councils must be expanded by every means locally. These councils sometimes do not know what their duties are, although they must engage not in the sharing of power with party and trade union organizations but in the implementation of economic reform.

Here is a characteristic example: In the first quarter, the USSR Ministry of Finance persistently failed to allocate precious metals to our plant. The administration's dispatches remained unanswered. But when a telegram arrived signed by the chairman of the labor collective council, "the ice broke...." In brief, we must act! Economic accountability punishes dilatoriness and passiveness.

I hope the party conference will put an end to passiveness in party organizations. Rather too many inert Communists have proliferated who cover their inactivity with lofty phrases. [passage omitted]

Delegate Blames Ryzhkov for Plan Problems

LD0507171288 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1503 GMT on 5 July carries a 40-minute scheduled program on the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow.

The program comprises a studio discussion between three party conference delegates from the countryside, chaired by correspondent Dilbar Klado. Two of the delegates are kolkhoz chairmen and the third, M.A. Morozov, is a pensioner and former kolkhoz chairman. They discuss the importance of the party conference and Gorbachev's speech and express support for glasnost and perestroyka, but fear that the conservatives will try to wreck progress. They agree that all is still far from well on the farms and attack the "dictatorship" of Gosplan and the poor quality of machinery sent to the peasantry by the working class. One of the participants attacks the bureaucracy in the regional agro-industrial organizations. They all agree that the peasants are not yet ready for open marketing, and some doubts are expressed at using purely the profit motive in deciding what to grow. At this point Morozov says:

"Nowadays there is a lot of criticism of ministries, saying that they give incorrect plans, that they have effectively wrecked the decision on state enterprises, on self-financing, and on financial autonomy of enterprises, that they have been giving unrealistic plans and unrealistic state orders. But Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, speaking in Siberia, said that the creation of these plans was farmed out to the ministries and departments, as he put it. But I do not agree. Who are these ministers? If you were to sit them at this table with Nikolay Ivanovich here, you'd have the Council of Ministers! Why put the blame on the ministers? It is Ryzhkov who is guilty: He heads the ministries. So why does he not admit that it was he who did it, who farmed out things to these ministers? Well, evidently here too not everything is as it should be. Evidently somebody put these ministers in such conditions. Perhaps Abalkin was right in saying it's either quality or quantity. However, you can't have both quality and quantity; but the government and the Central Committee obviously have the policy of both quality and quantity. Will that get us anywhere?"

He goes on to quote an example of modernization of a factory, then continues:

"In their speeches the delegates made a lot of criticism. It was the first time that I had heard criticism directed at the government, at the Central Committee and the Politburo of the Central Committee. And they were all right. I support them all. So the forum was very open, very broad, very big, very interesting. Obviously it will give us all food for thought—in the Council of Ministers, the Central Committee, the Politburo, and the oblasts, rayons, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the factories. If we all now together do not vigorously get a grip on perestroyka, if we allow it to skid, then, as they said at the conference, where is there to go? There is no way to go; that's it."

Ministry Aides React to Kabaidze Speech

PM0407142788 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Single Edition p 1

[S. Blagodarov article: "'Can You Really Talk About a Minister Like This!' What the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry Thinks About the Speech by Delegate V.P. Kabaidze"]

[Text] Scarcely any of the delegates to the 19th party conference, or we, the television viewers or radio audience, remained indifferent to the blunt and very frank speech by V.P. Kabaidze, general director of the "Ivanovo-Sofia" Science and Production Association. Vladimir Pavlovich talked about a most painful subject—scientific and technical progress which is making no progress—and he sharply criticized his sector headquarters and the minister personally.

The next day we called in at the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry and asked V.K. Papanov, first deputy minister, to comment on the delegate's speech.

[Papanov] Everyone applauded Kabaidze for saying that he does not need the ministry. And indeed, why should he need it if he finds himself in an advantageous position: The Ivanovo workers keep 90 percent of the profit, while others get only half or less. It is easier to destroy than to create the something new that is proposed to take the place of the ministries; the question is—what should they be like in the new conditions.

[Blagodarov] What are your proposals in this regard?

[Papanov] I shall be wary about expressing my opinion until firm decisions have been made. There is a lot of fuss over Kabaidze. Do you know that he did not fulfill the plan this year? His proposal that the ministries switch to self-financing and not live off the state budget is stupid. I am not talking about such tactless phrases as: "If the minister is not going to catch mice, then we will not feed him." What a thing to say about a minister! A member of the government! I would not say this from such a rostrum—or even from a less prestigious one.

There was irritation and indignation in V.K. Papanov's words. Fear of the living, unvarnished word seems hardly suitable for the present day.

Now about the unfulfilled plan. We call Ivanovo.

"Did the ministry not tell you," V.V. Pavlychev, chief economist at the "Ivanovo-Sofia" Science and Production Association, said, "that we are not fulfilling the plan this year because the product range has been virtually completely renewed? By 80 percent in comparison with 1985. Fundamentally new processing centers are more productive than the old, but more labor-intensive. New output is never easy, but there is no breakthrough without it.

"About our privileged circumstances. They simply do not exist. This 90 percent profit goes entirely into the association's new construction. It has taken many years to get this right. In 1990, when construction will be completed, our profit will be even smaller than for others—30 percent. Although the government resolution allows us to keep up to 50 percent."

Ye.D. Vinogradov, deputy secretary of the USSR Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool Building party committee:

"Can you really talk like this from an all-union platform. People abroad are listening to us, what will they think! It is true that Kabaidze is not shy, he always speaks like that at our collegium. We give Kabaidze the green light in everything—he is successful. If all plants were given these conditions maybe they would work better. And anyway, what is meant by this talk about not needing the ministry! It is said that they are indeed the main obstacle to restructuring. But our Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry has the cream of the sector and the best specialists, we restructured ourselves a long time ago. So maybe we only need to step up our work.

"We work according to instructions and paperwork. But this paperwork comes from above. Each year there are hundreds of different documents. So we are also obliged to espouse this paper principle of leadership. In this sense Kabaidze is right—such ministries are not needed. The ministries' functions in these conditions have remained the same. And no new system has been proposed to replace them."

This is the first reaction to the delegate's speech from the USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry....

IZVESTIYA Editorial Hails Conference

PM0507153188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jul 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The 19th Party Conference on the Pace of Restructuring"]

[Text] Time is needed to fully ponder, assess, and absorb all the multiplicity of thoughts and ideas advanced at the 19th party conference. But the essence of the decisions adopted here is understandable to all. Restructuring must work; restructuring must move forward more rapidly!

Let us recall how we came to restructuring. We began with the realization of a simple fact: It was simply impossible to live as we had been living before. The fundamental strategy for urgent change was formulated at the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum. The basis of these changes was the democratization of all spheres of the life of Soviet society and economic reform.

We are all well aware of how much effort was required to start the projected path. The 27th CPSU Congress laid the theoretical and practical foundation for restructuring. This foundation was honed and updated at subsequent Central Committee plenums. But life constantly posed new tasks requiring nontraditional solutions. Pondering these tasks and proposing answers to them was the work which the delegates to the 19th party conference took upon themselves.

For the past several days, the attention of hundreds of millions of people—Communists and nonparty people alike—was riveted on the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. Everything was unusual and unaccustomed! There was an acute, principled, and unbiased discussion. Words were heard which were both very bitter and very upsetting (sometimes for some individual, sometimes for all of us) but were always imbued with vital concern for the country's fate. Delegates did not express only their personal opinion. They conveyed the instructions of Communists, party organizations, and labor collectives, defending them with passion and conviction.

It can be asserted without exaggeration: The conference reflected the new political atmosphere which is now being asserted in the country and demonstrated the new level of democracy reached by the party and the whole of Soviet society in the just over 3 years since the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum.

During the period of discussion of the Central Committee Theses for the 19th party conference, some of our readers expressed the view that the document was declamatory in nature and did not make it possible to judge the nature of the projected decisions. As time has shown, this conclusion was somewhat hasty. The decisions took shape in the course of the conference's work; therefore, most delegates' speeches were not only critical but also constructive in nature.

So how is the main result of the work done to be defined?

To be very concise: Programmatic political stances were elaborated on all the fundamental questions which were the subject of partywide and nationwide discussion on the basis of the Central Committee Theses and which subsequently became the theme of the animated discussion in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. The conference confirmed once again that the party possesses a precise action program defined by the 27th CPSU Congress and improved with the accumulated experience of restructuring. The conference and the preparation for it showed once again that the party has the universal support of the people.

The conference not only approved the proposals submitted by the Central Committee but also, to a large extent, enriched them with proposals from party organizations and labor collectives.

In essence, the conference examined the entire complex of problems facing the party and the country. But its attention was centered on the party's role as the political vanguard.

The conference mapped out the intention that a situation will be achieved in which the CPSU will be a Leninist-type party in the full sense in terms of both content and work methods. In other words, it must firmly abandon command and edict methods and implement its policy through organizational, cadre, and ideological work—naturally, with the strictest observance of Soviet laws and democratic principles of public life.

In this connection, the conference profoundly and comprehensively examined the question: Will the reform of the political system not lead to the weakening of the party's leading role? The response was unequivocal: No, and no again! Remaining the ruling party, our party possesses all necessary levers for implementing its leadership role.

The conference adopted a resolution "On Certain Urgent Measures for the Practical Implementation of the Reform of the Country's Political System." It stresses the need for this year's report and election campaign in party organizations to be guided by the conference decisions on the reform of the political system and the democratization of the party's life. It has been decided to implement by the end of this year the reorganization of the party apparatus and essential changes to its structure, taking account of the decisions adopted on the demarcation of functions between the party and the soviets.

The conference advocated the submission for examination by the next USSR Supreme Soviet session of draft legislative enactments on the restructuring of soviet organs, essential amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution, and also the organization of elections and conducting of a congress of people's deputies in April 1989 at which new organs of state power will be formed.

After a comprehensive and sometimes extremely stormy discussion, the conference adopted other resolutions incorporating amendments and additions: "On the Progress of the Implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress Decisions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring" and "On the Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System"; "On the Struggle Against Bureaucratism"; "On Interethnic Relations"; "On Glasnost"; "On Legal Reform." In aggregate, all these documents signify a major milestone in the development of the Leninist line of the Central Committee April Plenum and the 27th party congress and in the development of the theory and practice of restructuring.

The period of keen, complex debates has passed. The resolutions have been adopted. The decisions have been determined. What is the most important thing now?

To work.

To do the job.

To put the plans into practice.

After the conference ended, some of the delegates came to our editorial office. Here are their opinions.

Ivan Pavlovich Grushchenko, rector of Kiev Higher Party School: The conference changed in principle our ideas about the work of the party leader. The indicator of a political leader's maturity now is the standard of his work among the masses, his capacity for convincing people, his ability to lead them. Of course, some people find it hard to get rid of conservatism and stagnation in thought and action. But there is no other way. The party's cadre corps must today act as the champion of the political, spiritual, and cultural values of the entire Soviet people and be a kind of catalyst of their moral traditions.

Vasiliy Petrovich Ryabokon, first secretary of Vinnitsa party gorkom: On returning home, first of all, I will try to convey to the Communists not only the letter but the spirit of the conference. I am convinced that much is now changing in the work of our local party organizations. But the main thing, the most important thing, is without any hesitation, without any delay, to put the decisions adopted into practice.

The delegates are convinced that the conference fulfilled its main task. Specific, clear, simple answers were given to the questions: How should we live now, how can we ensure the deepening of restructuring and guarantees of its irreversibility, how can we progress toward the further democratization of society and the defense of Soviet people's rights and freedoms?

Of course, any transformations in society are inconceivable without major changes in the economic sphere. That is why the problems of economic reform were discussed so thoroughly, so searchingly at the conference. The conference expressed itself very clearly: We must really set about completing the work of dismantling the braking mechanism. The radical economic reform must proceed more energetically.

The conference delegates unanimously noted the need to concentrate efforts, at the present stage, on the resolution of the food problem and to set as a priority the task of giving all-around assistance to our peasantry and boosting agriculture.

As the conference delegates stressed, its most important feature is that urgent problems of politics and economics were discussed here in close linkage with the spiritual sphere, and received, so to speak, their moral dimension. It probably could not be otherwise. At the present stage of social development, in conditions where the scientific and technical revolution influences all processes, no

problems can really be resolved without the people's intellectual and moral potential. Hence a heightened tone was set at the conference on the problems of education, science, and culture.

Of course, the results of the conference's work are not confined to the resolutions adopted. Its decisions cover all spheres of our life and will direclty affect the interests of every Soviet family and every Soviet person.

And everyone today must say to himself:

We have and will have pluralism of opinions, judgments, and assessments—that is remarkable.

But when decisions are adopted, we have always had, have, and will continue to have unity of actions.

Public Reaction to Conference Reported

LD0307130588 [Editorial Report] Moscow in English to North America at 2300 GMT on 2 July carries 4.5 minute report on an opinion poll conducted by a radio correspondent in the Moscow streets. People were asked what aspects of the CPSU conference interested them most, what they supported or opposed.

A 40-year-old mathematician said guarantees are needed against a personality cult in the future. The proposal that tenure of office should be limited to two terms is not enough for true democracy. "I think our constitution should provide for the activities of other political parties," he remarked.

A TASS employee expressed satisfaction with the conference but still has some apprehensions. She is afraid that not all that was mentioned at the conference will be successfully implemented, for not all properly understand restructuring, and that concerns the leaders in particular. She liked the proposal of a Nizhniy Tagil worker to make Politburo members responsible for certain regions or industries.

A journalist was worried that too little attention has been paid at the conference to economic reform.

An assembly worker said: "I liked the speech of the party secretary from Komi Autonomous Republic, who said that the Politburo members over 70 should retire. He frankly named them, people who worked with Brezhnev and who are now adapting to the new policies. I am disappointed to see Gorbachev's mild treatment of the opponents of restructuring, and though he said he could bang the table if necessary I haven't yet seen that."

A geophysicist noted the part of Gorbachev's report dealing with science. "Among the speakers I'd single out Korotich, editor of OGONEK. The magazine published an article accusing some of the delegates of bribery, and that took some pluck."

A lawyer disagreed with at least one proposal made at the conference, that secretaries of local party committees be made chairmen of local councils. He thought this would be contrary to the policy of separating party and state functions.

A land surveyor said he is very glad that the majority of delegates favor an active and critical press.

A store assistant said: "I liked that speaker who frankly attacked Stalin's personality cult. I feel that the conference was held in an atmosphere of openness. For a long time we haven't had anything like that."

An architect said that he had liked it when delegates quoted figures and named specific people. This gave him hope that glasnost and perestroyka will continue.

Western Reactions to Conference Deemed Premature

PM0507111388 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 5 Jul 88 p 7

[Commentator Gennadiy Gerasimov "World on Tuesday" article: "First Wave"]

[Text] Last Saturday the 19th all-union party conference press center closed and the journalists began rapidly to depart for home. Too rapidly, in my view. Their work of understanding the event can hardly be considered complete for the simple reason that the documents adopted at the conference had not yet been published in full. Therefore a second wave of commentaries is to be expected.

The first wave dealt with the atmosphere of the discussion that took place and the arguments used in it. As one journalist put it, the "lifeless protocol of past meetings was thrown onto the scrapheap of history." Another correspondent observed that in the strikingly open atmosphere of the discussion, frankness frequently turned into revelation. A third journalist noted occasional signs of an inability to debate properly without descending to attempts to debase one's opponent.

As for the arguments themselves, Western observers sorted them into the two halves of the scales. One category for the so-called "conservatives," by which they mean not those who are openly opposed to restructuring—such people are swallowed up in the mass of those who welcome it—but those quiet saboteurs of restructuring who seek, in the words of Flora Lewis of THE NEW YORK TIMES, to "Brezhnevize Gorbachev." And the other category consists of the supporters of rapid restructuring.

It was noted that on an individual level the "conservatives" were as elusive as the actual bureaucrats were invisible.

When deciding which way the scales invented by the Western observers had tipped, the verdict went to the active supporters of restructuring. If you base your verdict on the debate itself. You get a different picture, in their opinion, if you base your judgment on the audience's reaction to the controversial passages in the speeches. Here, it seems to them, is where the "conservatives" lashed out. Furthermore, some commentators pointed to possible inaccuracies stemming from the different standards of conduct. Be that is it may, this was no unanimous gathering of enthusiasts. Which, of course, is due to the specific nature of the situation. As THE WASHINGTON POST wrote in an editorial, the task of improving the party as an instrument of policy is an enormous task roughly on the scale of Russia itself....

Nevertheless, the generalizations were premature because the journalists were commenting on the speeches and proposals, not on the final results. And here the greatest attention was drawn to aspects of the debates among the writers and the scientists, the verbal pyrotechnics of V.P. Kabaidze, the speech by B.N. Yeltsin which was publicized in the West, and so on.

The Western observers' preliminary conclusions may be summarized in approximately these terms: The Soviet Union is entering a period of radical changes in party, state, and economic life in conditions of glasnost, democratization, and legality but the guarantees of success are not visible.

Here, for example, is the opinion of F. Lewis again:

"The gap between word and deed and theory and practice, which is so characteristic of the Soviets, persists. The question of how to ensure the responsiveness of the one-party system to people's needs and how to compel the authorities to obey their own laws and respect citizens' rights is first posed outright and then confidently avoided."

F. Lewis would probably not be so sure that the "question is being avoided" if she were to acquaint herself with the conference documents. But if one relies solely on precedents it is not easy to raise objections to her. At the conference itself there was much talk about good decisions in the past which have disappeared into the bureaucratic quagmire. But I recall a conversation with the U.S. lawyer Hazard, a specialist in Soviet law. We were discussing the new Soviet Constitution, and when I asked the Professor for his opinion of it, he answered: It is a good Constitution, but so was the old one, it only needed to be put into practice...."

Some commentators approached the conference from their own standpoint. For example, A. Rosenthal from THE NEW YORK TIMES would like us to agree to the appearance of an organized political opposition and William Safire, from the same newspaper, cites former President Nixon, who told him that the improvement of relations with the Soviet Union runs the "risk of contributing to our own demise." Last week, the week of the conference, similar warnings were given by Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci and presidential advisers Richard Powell and Edward Rowny. Tony Barber, REUTER's correspondent in Washington, explains:

"Some representatives of the administration have expressed surprise at U.S. public opinion's high level of approval of Gorbachev's activity—over 70 percent according to a recent poll—and indicated that the public should be told more about Soviet military might."

But those are American "conservatives"—extremes in politics rarely tally....

Glazunov Views World Reaction

LD0407134588 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 4 Jul 88

[Text] And now let's look at the world's reaction to the results of the Soviet Communists' 19th conference, which has ended in Moscow. Commentary is by our political observer Viktor Glazunov.

The party conference has left no one indifferent, Viktor Glazunov points out, and this equally applies to this country and to foreign countries, that's a fact. But it's also a fact that reaction in the world is not all of a similar kind. Everybody agrees that the conference was a great event, a destiny-determining one for the Soviet Union, and having an impact on the world development as a whole. It is noted that what the world will be like in the 21st century depends on whether or not perestroyka will work.

London's SUNDAY TIMES writes that the conference will go down in history as a turning point and that the unprecedented open debate, together with the adoption of wide-scope political reforms, signified that the USSR will possibly never more be the same.

Yes indeed, the issue concerns our country's renovation. Through revolutionary perestroyka we will certainly come, as the conference results convince us, to a qualitatively new state of Soviet society, to a new humane and democratic aspect of socialism, Viktor Glazunov says. And it looks like precisely this prospect that's causing the anxiety of some quarters in the bourgeois world. They have begun to speak about a certain perfidious maneuver of the Kremlin. The United States President's former National Security adviser Brent Scowcroft, while admitting the uniqueness of the event that took place in Moscow, urges the West not to get into a trap by thinking that the USSR will turn into a parliamentary democracy. But why try [to] push through open doors? It's stated with ample clarity and written down in the decisions of the party which governs this country that we are for

socialism and for having more of it, and that there'll be more socialist democracy, not the bourgeois one. Nobody in the USSR intends to mislead anyone in the West on this country.

In his deliberations one can clearly trace the desire to try to the utmost to cast a shadow on the USSR and sow doubt as to this country's aims. After all, the image of enemy that had so long and so tirelessly been painted of us is now withering to naught. The Soviet Union, the French paper LE FIGARO admits, is no longer viewed in the West as earlier, no longer regarded as a state presenting a danger. Therefore, NATO has what [as heard] to worry about in connection with the destruction of the idea of the USSR as an enemy.

So this is the crux of the issue: NATO needs the image of an enemy so as to justify its existence, and the policy of frightening, the policy of force. If there is no enemy, then who can be the scare target and what's the revival of United States military might needed for, a revival that was with such delight mentioned a few days ago by the current United States Vice President George Bush, who aspires to enter the White House? He claims that the cold war is not over and that America and its allies should be ready for a protracted conflict.

The USSR, Viktor Glazunov goes on to say, is sparing no effort to boost social and economic development and to make Soviet people better off. It proposes abandoning confrontation and has projected a program providing for a comprehensive security system in conditions of radical disarmament, but in reply we hear the West's got to be strong and be ready for a protracted conflict with the USSR. However, this country is for ending the cold war trends as soon as possible and for demilitarizing and humanizing international relations. The results of the Soviet Communist Party's 19th conference showed this in all clarity.

PRC View of Party Conference Observed

LD3006081888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Our Beijing correspondent Vladimir Kulikov tells us how the work of the 19th all-union party conference is being perceived in China.

[Kulikov] Special interest is being evoked in China by the discussions connected with the restructuring of our country's political system. At the center of Soviet people's attention are questions of the party's role and position in society and of the principles of party leadership of public life, notes a XINHUA commentator. It is now considered necessary in the Soviet Union to diversify forms of management, scales of enterprises, and forms of property, and to give a positive role to the market mechanism.

Nowadays I often have occasion to meet with Chinese economists, cultural figures, and ordinary citizens who are literally assailing me with questions about the Soviet perestroyka, about glasnost, and about the party conference in Moscow. The interest is caused by the fact that the fairly wide coverage of all these questions in the Chinese press has opened up to the Chinese public the depth and breadth of the problems facing our party and state.

Bloc Countries' Greetings Messages Published

CPCZ Central Committee

PM3006115988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 8

[Undated message from the CPCZ Central Committee to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, carried under the general heading "Greetings From Foreign Parties"]

[Text] Moscow

Dear Comrades!

On behalf of the CPCZ Central Committee, the Czechoslovak Communists, and our country's people we send the 19th all-union conference of Soviet Communists cordial, comradely greetings and wishes for complete success in its work.

The Communists and people of our country are following with exceptional interest the revolutionary transformations which are being implemented in the Soviet Union under the CPSU's leadership. The political line of the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums meets with the full approval of the Czechoslovak Communists and has become a source of inspiration and experience in resolving the difficult tasks of socialist building in the CSSR.

Taking into consideration the objective necessity to revive dynamism in socialism's development, our party also put forward at its 17th Congress new tasks in the sphere of political, economic and social restructuring and democratization in Czechoslovakia. Life and labor in conditions of peace are the basic prerequisites for achieving these bold revolutionary goals. This has produced universal and full support for the CPSU and Soviet state's bold and flexible foreign policy, which is already marked by the first positive results—the Treaty between the USSR and the United States on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The Czechoslovak people also want to live in peace and to make their own contribution to the process of improvement and revolutionary renewal in socialist society.

We wish you, all Soviet Communists, and the people of the fraternal Soviet Union every success in the restructuring work and in implementing the decisions which the

19th all-union conference will make in the interests of accelerating the USSR's socioeconomic development and strengthening the positions of socialism and peace throughout the world.

The CPCZ Central Committee.

SED, Honecker Message

PM3006104188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 8

[Greetings message from the SED Central Committee under the general heading "Greetings From Foreign Parties"]

[Text] To the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, Moscow

Dear Comrades!

The GDR Communists send the delegates of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference fraternal militant greetings and express confidence that the conference will be an important landmark on the path to fulfilling the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. The strengthening of socialism on the basis of accelerated socioeconomic development in the Soviet Union, and the latter's initiative-filled struggle for peace are very significant for the country of Lenin and for the growth of socialism's attractiveness throughout the world. This will give the peoples a powerful new impetus in their struggle for a peaceful future.

The GDR Communists and people will continue to do everything to thoroughly strengthen the indissoluble fraternal union with the country and party of Lenin. This was, is, and will be the basis of all the GDR's steps.

We assure you, dear comrades, that, on the basis of the decisions of the 11th SED Congress, the GDR's working people will continue to build a developed socialist society and thus make its contribution to consolidating socialism and ensuring peace.

We wish the Soviet Communists every success in the work of the the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

With communist greetings,

SED Central Committee

General Secretary Erich Honecker

Jaruzelski Conveys PZPR Greetings

PM3006095188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 8

[Greetings message from the PZPR Central Committee under the general heading "Greetings From Foreign Parties"]

[Text] To the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, Moscow

Dear Comrade Delegates,

The PZPR Central Committee sends you fraternal communist greetings and best wishes for successful and fruitful work. The Polish Communists and working people of our country have followed with enormous interest, sincere sympathy, and full support the large-scale party discussion preceding your conference, which took place in the Leninist spirit on the basis of the decisions of the April plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress.

The breakthrough stage in the historic process of building socialism, the acknowledged necessity to utilize fully its material and spiritual assets in line with the working peoples' aspirations and needs, and the particular role which the CPSU is playing in this condition the fact that your conference is at the center of attention of all forces of socialism, progress, and peace.

Proceeding along the path of socialist renewal which coincides in its aims with the basic principles of Soviet restructuring and glasnost, the PZPR and Polish society show complete solidarity with your creative work. The all-around development of our fraternal relations, and of our unity and cooperation has reached the highest level and scale of its entire history.

The coming visit to Poland by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will be an important event in the history of our relations, and will serve to deepen our friendship, to develop new forms of cooperation, and to bring our peoples closer together.

The PZPR Central Committee and all Communists and people of labor, sensing the firmness of the bonds of fraternal friendship tying our parties and peoples, convey to you cordial greetings and express confidence that the conference decisions will make an important contribution to developing the theory and practice of socialist building, and to the bold idea of restructuring which is freeing the creative forces of the party and the Soviet people.

On behalf of the PZPR Central Committee, W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. Warsaw.

Belorussia's Sokolov Interviewed on Conference

LD0107084588 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1730 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Interview with Yefram Sokolov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee, by unidentified correspondent; date and place not given—live or recorded; Sokolov speaks in Russian with superimposed Polish translation]

[Text] [Correspondent] Comrade Secretary, we have acquainted ourselves with your statements at the conference and have received them with approval. We Poles liked them. We are neighbors, and we are interested in your affairs. We are pleased about Belorussia's high pace of development and restructuring. How did you achieve such a pace?

[Sokolov] We did not achieve it immediately. Before this happened, the party organization and all inhabitants of the republic had to put much effort into the creation of a strong infrastructure. We succeeded in creating such an infrastructure, and thanks to that, we now have achieved certain results. Are they good? Not yet, but we need time to increase them greatly.

[Correspondent] How do you assess cooperation with Poland?

[Sokolov] We have very good direct contacts with Brzesc, Terespol; there are very close contacts between Poland and the Grodno Region. Polish Contacts with Vitebsk and Minsk Oblasts have become more animated. To put it briefly, six of our oblasts have very good contacts with your voivodships. Cooperation between enterprises and the exchange of party, Union, and youth activists continues. There are contacts between scholars. recently, we succeeded in extending cooperation in to the area of culture,

[Correspondent] And now a few words on the hopes your republic pins on the party conference.

[Sokolov] We attach great hopes to the conference. Everyone has read and knows the reports. We not only support but will implement all the assumptions in the report. The report itself is of a revolutionary nature. It is a very concrete and matter-of-fact document that was very well received by all the delegates, and not only by those from Belorussia, but from throughout the country. We are proud that we have such a general secretary and such a program.

Weekly Interviews Latvia's Pugo on Conference

PM0107170888 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 27 2-8 Jul 88 (Signed to Press 30 Jun) pp 2-3

[Interview with B.K. Pugo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and delegate to the 19th all-union party conference, by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent N. Zyatkov: "Time for Responsible Decisions"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Zyatkov] Boris Karlovich, which of the problems being discussed at the conference most concern you personally?

[Pugo] The improvement of national relations. The situation demands it. And although much has been done in this respect, there are a mass of problems that demand to be resolved on a countrywide scale. Thus in my view it is necessary to formulate a clear concept of the restructuring of relations between nationalities and a comprehensive union-wide program for resolving the problems that have accumulated in this sphere. It is clearly expedient to give some thought to the creation of a permanent working body to coordinate this activity, similar to the People's Commissariat for Nationalities Affairs which was set up at one time on V.I. Lenin's initiative.

[Zyatkov] Tell me, can the republican newspapers criticize republican Communist Party Central Committee workers, bureau members, and you personally? Are viewpoints that do not coincide with the official view openly expressed in your republic?

[Pugo] Whatever else there may be, there has been plenty of criticism recently. And different kinds of criticism: from the constructive to the quick-tempered and emotional. Take the elections of delegates to the party conference. The holding of the elections and the composition of those elected were also criticized, and on the whole not without justification. Lack of experience and time prevented us from carrying out this work without errors. At the final stage 114 Communists were presented in the republican press, with information on their professions, posts, and places of work. Let me note that in all, 356 people were discussed at the first stage. It was necessary finally to elect 53 people. Which was done by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum. Reports of the plenum and its results were made public.

Coming back to the question of glasnost and criticism of us, I would like to draw attention to the publication of materials from the republican Writers' Union plenum with the participation of other creative unions and various experts. In 2 days 70 people spoke, making frank, trenchant contributions. Newspapers, issued in Russian and Latvian, published detailed accounts which

took up virtually all four pages of the issue. The following day once again nearly half the newspapers' pages were devoted to the plenum's resolution and a letter to the 19th party conference and M.S. Gorbachev.

Since, in addition to trenchant and sometimes merciless criticism, the speeches also contained one-sidedness, prejudice, and emotional outbursts, some people had doubts: Should all this be published, and especially, should the pages of the party press be made available?

[Zyatkov] And what was your reply to them?

[Pugo] First, the majority of the criticisms contained a constructive, creative basis. Second, in view of the complex ideological situation in the republic and the problems in relations between nationalities, it is important, given the pluralism of opinions, to present them openly, and then discuss them equally openly and come to some decision. Otherwise, those same opinions will circulate in the form of rumors, conjectures, and so forth.

[Zyatkov] We are talking about trenchant critical appraisals. But we have not quoted them. Let me cite a few propositions from the concluding documents of the writers' plenum. "For the first time in their many centuries of history the Latvian people are tragically becoming a national minority in their own territory," it is necessary to "proclaim the language of the indigenous nationality the state language of the republic," "in the next 5-year plan we should go over to full regional (republican) economic accountability and self-financing," "the lack of citywide purification installations in Riga has done almost irremediable damage to the Gulf of Riga." Latvia as a sovereign national state within the federation of Soviet republics could be "accepted as a member of the United Nations and UNESCO, the Olympic Committee, and other international organizations," and "all the innocent victims of Stalinism should be rehabilitated and their memory perpetuated."

[Pugo] A positive decision has already been made on that last proposal. Work has also been accelerated on the construction of purification installations in Riga. As for the other proposals, as a basis for the discussion of the accumulated problems they have every right to exist. That is the opinion of representatives of the creative intelligentsia. There are other population categories in the republic, they too will express their opinion.

I think increasing each republic's responsibility and autonomy, so that it earns its own budget rather than receiving it from the all-union budget, and glasnost on these matters will also help to remove the petty-minded conjectures on the subject of "who feeds whom." And, most important, we should not forget that there is in our country an integrated national economic complex that forms the basis of our entire economy.

[Zyatkov] Boris Karlovich, let us come back to the problem of party openness and informing members and all working people about the work of party organs and the apparatus. For decades we have explained and shown in detail how to smelt steel, milk cows, sow grain.... Publicity for the work of a party leader amounted to his speeches, his presence on presidiums, and various protocol events. Allow us to look a little more deeply through this outward veneer. At what time does your working day begin?

[Pugo] At 8:30.

[Zyatkov] And when does it end?

[Pugo] Also at 8:30, but in the evening.

[Zyatkov] Are you driven to work in an official car?

[Pugo] A car is, of course, assigned to me. And I use it for official trips around the republic and around the city. I usually walk to and from work. It takes roughly half an hour each way.

[Zyatkov] Do you use public transportation? Do you go shopping?

[Pugo] Yes. I do both. I know first-hand about the problems of the shortage of food and goods and the overcrowding of public transportation. My nine key tasks include supplies of food and consumer goods, and transportation.

[Zyatkov] Why nine?

[Pugo] There is a kind of leader's manual. I usually write the most important, key tasks in it. It is reasoned that there can only be a maximum of nine—seven for work and two personal ones.

[Zyatkov] And what else is written there?

[Pugo] Cadres, ideology, how the introduction of the law on the state enterprises is going, housing and construction materials—for us, that is a most important matter—cooperatives, ecology and culture, and last, ideas.

[Zyatkov] And what about the two personal tasks?

[Pugo] I used to have them. Not any more.

[Zyatkov] But writing a problem down is only half the job. So how many serious decisions have been made in our republic on various matters...

[Pugo] Of course, writing it down cannot solve the problem. But as an element in monitoring the organization of work, it is useful. You see, I plan current tasks for every day and mark off their fulfillment. And at the end of the page there is a line with a "key" on it and the

numbers of the key tasks. You have to mark whether anything has been done in that area. This kind of self-monitoring is essential in the press of day-to-day work.

[Zyatkov] A 12-hour working day. Today is Saturday, and it looks as if that is also a permanent working day for you.... Why this schedule?

[Pugo] You know, even that is sometimes not enough. Sometimes at the end of the working day you feel disappointed: I did not find time for this, I did not do that...

What is the reason? I think the time has come for more responsible decisions. Formerly, papers were signed in 5 minutes. Now you take them, and put it off for 3 days or so. You think about it, consult.

Very much work time goes on conversations and meetings. Once again, formerly you could say the word and it was done, but now you have to convince people that your position is correct. Secretaries of party committees and primary party organizations and ordinary Communists have started telephoning the Central Committee or visiting us more often.

I think that as a minimum it is necessary to visit the collectives once a week, and I try to stick to that rule.

[Zyatkov] What is the pay for your labor and the other republican leaders?

[Pugo] My salary is R650. The chairman of the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers and the chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium receive the same. The average wage for a Latvian Communist Party Central Committee worker is R289. If he carries out his duties well and receives bonuses, it is R337.

[Zyatkov] And do you have any bonuses?

[Pugo] No bonuses. So-called "rest and recuperation" payments equal to 1 month's salary are paid once a year.

[Zyatkov] Is this the highest wage in the republic?

[Pugo] To the best of my knowledge many shop chiefs and enterprise and production association directors have wages of about the same level. Some are higher: For example, the directors of enterprises that have switched to the new management conditions receive R710-750 a month.

[Zyatkov] Boris Karlovich, in letters to ARGUMENTY I FAKTY readers, including from Riga, draw our attention to the existence of special stores.

[Pugo] We have no such special stores. There used to be one in the city, but we closed it down. As at many enterprises, our trade union has organized a desk where you can place orders for things. It doesn't offer caviar or luxury fish, but it does have the products a family needs. Such order desks and food stores have been set up at 285 enterprises.

[Zyatkov] Please tell us where party workers go for treatment, and do they have benefits when getting housing?

[Pugo] What there is is an interdepartmental medical and health section of the Fourth Administration of the Latvian SSR Ministry of Health, which incorporates health centers, hospitals, and sanatoriums. The people served by the Fourth Administration are defined by a Latvian SSR Council of Ministers resolution and total around 9,000. They include October Revolution and Civil War participants, Lettish Red Riflemen, party and labor veterans who have personal pensioner status, people who have been awarded lofty titles and decorations of the motherland, USSR and Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet deputies, members and candidate members of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and members of the Auditing Commission, outstanding figures in science, culture, and the arts, certain categories of central and local party, soviet, and trade union organ workers, ministry and department leadership workers and creative union chairmen and secretaries, mass media leaders, and correspondents for central publications.

Housing allocation questions are resolved in accordance with the legislation established in the republic. If we transfer a person from a rayon to work in Riga we naturally provide him with an apartment, and we also improve the housing conditions of workers with growing families. We used to build separate houses for these purposes, but now we take a share in the urban development carried out by the Riga Gorispolkom. The last house we saw built for leadership workers was built by the republic Council of Ministers Administration of Affairs, which committed a number of violations when distributing housing. The Central Committee Bureau reprimanded the Council of Ministers leadership and called to account the workers who had displayed personal immodesty.

Let me cite one more figure: As of 1 July there is to be a 40 percent cut in the number of official vehicles in organizations financed out of the USSR or republic budget.

Usually there are questions about dachas. We have a common dacha pool in Yurmala. Every year it is used by around 60,000 inhabitants of the republic, including party, soviet, and economic organ executives. Quite naturally, these dachas are made available for a corresponding payment. Incidentally, evidently not everyone knows that even quite recently party and soviet workers were not allowed to build their own dachas and have garden or vegetable plots, although in the republic as a whole 64,000 people have garden plots and 118,000 families have vegetable plots.

Today we monitor things even more strictly to ensure that the distribution of social benefits comes within the framework of the republic Council of Ministers decisions on this score, which for their part were compiled on the basis of corresponding USSR Government resolutions.

[Zyatkov] We are currently reviewing a great deal. Might it also be worth taking another look at these decisions relating to the distribution of social benefits? It is no secret that many of the people who made decisions in past years tried first and foremost not to forget about themselves.

[Pugo] Life is making adjustments to our notions of social justice, of course, and naturally they must be reflected in various proivisions relating to the distribution of social benefits. But I do not believe that absolutely everyone would support a return to leveling. It is important that every working person's labor is assessed objectively and openly.

We are increasingly frequently coming up against the problem of cadres at this time. For example, we wanted to invite a good kolkhoz chairman to become a party raykom instructor. But the wages were R200—half of what the chairman is getting now. The average wage of raykom and gorkom secretaries is R295. So he wasn't able to take the job.

[Zyatkov] Boris Karlovich, today is Saturday; what would your wife normally be doing today? What is your family like?

[Pugo] Usually she would be preparing lectures. She is a VUZ teacher. We have a son. He is a servicemen and lives away.

[Zyatkov] Do you have time to read books and literary journals? What do you do Sundays?

[Pugo] My wife and I joke that you have to be sick to be able to read all the interesting things in the periodicals, not to mention books. In this respect I've been kind of "lucky." I was sick recently and read everything that is currently the subject of dispute and discussion.

Sundays? I read, go for walks with my granddaughter (admittedly I see less of her than I'd like), and generally try to relax if only a bit before the next working week.

Weekly 'Observers Roundtable' Discusses Reaction
LD0307204588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 3 Jul 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with presenter Vladimir Georgiyevich Pasko, Moscow radio commentator; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; and Vitali Yakovlevich Chukseyev, TASS Collegium member and chief foreign editor]

[Text] [Pasko] Hello, Comrades. Quite a few important events happened last week, but undoubtedly the most interesting and significant was the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. Those gathered at this table today have covered party forums on more than one occasion. For example, I have never seen anything more impressive. In saying that, I have in mind not so much the actual topic the delegates were discussing, but the atmosphere of the discussion, and the interesting, free, and businesslike way they spoke.

This not only makes one glad; it also inspires confidence that, despite all the difficulties, restructuring will be carried through to the end, and we will emerge onto the high road of accelerated socialist construction. That emergence, I think, is not far off. It's not far off because what we are engaged in is not superficial change but radical transformation; moreover, these transformations have become the whole nation's business. That is a fact that is not going unnoticed abroad.

[Shishlin] I do not think I would go so far as to say, though, that democratization is making gigantic strides. No, democratization is being achieved with difficulty, and the course of the conference's work has shown that. Radical economic reform is still more difficult. But the point is that the party conference conclusions—the things Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev discussed in his concluding speech—now inspire us, I think, to work even harder and more vigorously to ensure that the process we are initiating will not die down. I think good fuel has now been added to this bonfire. It has been fed with excellent thoughts and splendid ideas, which really are setting people alight and making it possible to expect that those guarantees of the irreversibility of restructuring—guarantees that the party conference strove to develop—will come into being.

[Chukseyev] As for reactions abroad, you know I simply cannot recall another event in the Soviet Union that has aroused such enormous interest in the West. Before the sittings at the Kremlin had even begun, politicians, businessmen, and journalists were asking themselves questions about its decisions, emphasizing that those decisions would determine the nature of development in the Soviet Union for many years to come. In the middle of June I happened to be in New York. The question that cropped up constantly in my encounters with Americans and in the telephone calls being received by the TASS office at that time was: What can we expect from the 19th party conference?

The speakers went on to explain that they would welcome a consolidation of the processes of change now taking place in our society. They stressed that the steady onward development of the Soviet Union would help strengthen and expand mutually beneficial contacts. So I suppose it is not surprising that on 28 June the leading foreign topics in the international press were the Kremlin sessions. Well, the U.S. television company CNN, for example, which is purely a news network, carried a direct relay of Comrade Gorbachev's report.

Other leading U.S. and European television stations transmitted extensive reports on the main points of that and other speeches. Here, for example, is what the ABC television news presenter Peter Jennings had to say on the subject: Last week was dominated by the historic party conference in the Soviet Union.

The Moscow correspondent of the same television company, William Rogers, reported: We have possibly witnessed the most open and animated debates since the Bolshevik revolution.

And his colleague from another television company, CBS, noted that those debates were not confined to the Palace of Congresses at the Kremlin. Here is an extract from his report last week: Discussion of the issues facing the country is going on not just at the party conference; something is now happening in Moscow that is rarely seen. Ordinary people are coming out into the streets to talk and argue, and this shows that they are taking seriously their leader's statement that all Soviet people must take part in determining their future.

Well, a word or two about official reactions. There has been a statement by by a British Foreign Office spokesman that is indicative in this respect. Here is what he said: We are closely following the changes taking place in the Soviet Union, particularly the improvements in such areas as the democratization of public life and human rights; the raising of these issues at such a major forum is naturally of considerable interest to us.

Well, many such statements are now being made. Interestingly enough, even the Pope has thought it necessary to have his say about the Soviet communist forum. He said: We should study carefully Gorbachev's report at the party conference before making a final judgement; but it is already clear that restructuring is bringing an expansion of democracy and is promoting the growth of people's political responsibility for the development of society. That process, said John Paul II, meets the internal needs not only of the Soviet Union, but of other countries as well.

Let me add that we can expect a steady flow of new reactions to party conference decisions as its decisions are increasingly studied and analyzed throughout the world.

[Shishlin] All foreign journalists—and there are a lot of them, as several hundred came to Moscow to cover the party conference—are now comparing themselves with John Reed: They say they are witnesses to a revolution, witnesses to events that are indeed shaking the world. That is true. Here it must be said right off that the party conference naturally devoted the lion's share of its attention to questions of our domestic policy; but certainly, foreign policy issues were also discussed in depth and in detail at the party conference. They were dealt with in the Central Committee general secretary's speech; and it goes without saying that in itself, the success of the new political thinking, which is still in the formation and development process; in itself the success of the new political thinking is inseparable from the deep internal processes that are taking place in our country. If the stereotypes and old ideas about our country are now being eroded, it is thanks to restructuring, because of restructuring, and because of the party's consistency in carrying out restructuring.

[Chukseyev] THE NEW YORK TIMES writes that the Soviet people and all the rest of the world expect results from the party conference. Let me remark immediately that this is not the only U.S. paper to draw that conclusion, and it's not being drawn only in the U.S. press. But there's something else, in my view, that merits analysis: Why is such enormous attention being paid to our party conference and our restructuring as a whole?

[Shishlin] Well, there was a time, I remember, when that same NEW YORK TIMES used to publish Soviet materials for payment. And as we all know, that is an utterly disgraceful practice, since when a political text is published as an advertisement, it's a 100-percent guarantee that no one will read it.

[Pasko] Yes, and because it's an advertisement, people treat it as such.

[Shishlin] Yes, yes. Well, why do I think...[Shishlin changes thought] No doubt every one of our listeners can answer this question. I think the main thing is that we are indeed living in a new world: an interconnected, mutually dependent world. And what happens in the Soviet Union, regardless of our national pride, affects the whole world, just as what happens in the United States, China, Japan, or West Europe does. The process of revolutionary renewal that the Soviet Union has begun will not only lead to the growth of our country's international prestige and the strengthening of our economic potential, but what is of great value is that it is reviving the power of our revolutionary example, the power of the moral ideal promoted by the October Revolution.

So it appears to me that per se, this wind of renewal, this fresh wind from Moscow, really is blowing away the thick dust that had gathered in international relations; that it really is introducing something new into the humdrum course of international life. In that sense, you know, I find myself thinking how quickly that summit meeting in Moscow, for all its significance, has receded into the shadows. The party conference has literally been devouring the attention and capturing the imagination. Whatever newspaper you pick up, or whatever wavelength you tune your radio to, you'll hear discussion of what exactly has been happening in Moscow.

[Chukseyev] Yes, and it was said at the party conference that restructuring in the Soviet Union has become a factor of worldwide importance; that the radical changes

that are happening at home have also demanded of us new approaches to international affairs, and this has left an impression on international relations as a whole.

[Pasko] Now, let us take for example the widespread discussion that has been going on in the West for many months as to what policy should be pursued in relation to the Soviet Union and the socialist community generally in light of these changes that are now occurring in our country. This is the central issue being discussed at practically all of the international forums now taking place in the West, at meetings between politicians and in the press. I would like to quote an excerpt from the final document of the Hannover Council of the European Communities meeting at the level of heads of state and government. They take as their first point East-West relations.

They write that relations between East and West have entered a phase of dynamic development. The 12 member states are fully determined to continue to play an active part in that process. All the same, I would like to say that on the whole there is little change, in my opinion, in the West's attitudes: They are still always approaching us from positions of strength. Rather indicative in this respect, as I see it, is the speech to the Washington National Press Club Monday by U.S. Secretary of Defense Carlucci, which was entirely devoted to East-West relations.

[Chukseyev] I agree, Vladimir Georgiyevich, that if one traces through the major meetings between representatives of the capitalist countries and speeches by prominent politicians that have taken place recently, one is struck by the fact that issues of East-West relations constantly figure in them.

[Pasko] Well, the heightened interest in this subject is mainly attributable to the recent talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan, which have given a boost to the positive development of world events. Here we have Carlucci saying at the National Press Club in Washington last week that—and I am quoting him—another step has been taken in Moscow in the ongoing dialogue with the Soviet Union; We have achieved progress on every point of the agenda—human rights, bilateral and regional problems, and arms control.

Although the defense secretary—intentionally or unintentionally, I do not know—put military matters last on that list, most of what he said was nonetheless on that subject. Carlucci's main thesis boiled down to the idea that the United States and its allies must act in accordance with their security interests. Well, to that one can scarcely object: The Soviet Union and its allies also place a high value on their own security interests. The question is how to provide it: by achieving difficult but so vitally important accords on arms control and arms limitation, or, on the contrary, by arming ourselves to the teeth? Unfortunately, the United States seems to me to be adhering to the second course. The defense secretary made it quite clear that in the dialogue with the Soviet Union, the United States intends to act from a position of strength; at the same time, he advocated strengthening U.S. deterrence forces. Listen to this, this is what he said: We cannot sacrifice such weapon systems as the sea-based cruise missiles just for the sake of the actual process of reducing armaments or making it easier to verify agreements in that area.

Well, it is obvious that that stance does not facilitate the current Geneva talks, but renders them more difficult.

[Shishlin] Yes, that is of course so, but on this subject I also think this. The Americans have of course been saying a great deal about the fact that they are conducting their policy from a position of strength, and so forth, and indeed the United States is not without its share of strength. But then one needs to take account too the fact that the Soviet Union also is not without its share of strength. The approximate military-strategic parity is just as much a reality as the existence of our two countries on this planet.

Therefore the bowing in the direction of policy from a position of strength often seems to me to be to a considerable extent a propaganda exercise, although it is importunate and does have a braking effect on the productivity of the Soviet-U.S. political dialogue. Incidentally Bush was speaking last week in San Francisco and he went altogether further than Carlucci. He stated that in his view the cold war was not over. And how is one to know? Perhaps Bush is right. But the fact that the cold war is dying down is worrying certain circles in the United States—circles which have grown accustomed to worshipping and putting their trust in strength and acting from a position of strength. However, it is also necessary to see that we should not fret and let ourselves become too deeply upset about this for the simple reason that there is nothing new in these expressions of reverence for the policy of acting from a position of strength. What is new and constitutes in point of fact the leading trend in international life—the trend toward dialogue and a search for a balance of interests—is making headway in various directions.

Take our relations with the Europeans! They are becoming very full and you see what is now being said. You were citing a British person, the foreign secretary. Take the latest judgements and pronouncements by Kohl, the West German chancellor, and Genscher, the vice chancellor and foreign minister, and the statements by Mitterrand. All of them have been interesting and fairly constructive statements.

Therefore I think that Moscow is at the present time being well heard and that Moscow's initiatives and Moscow's ideas are being well seen. In addition let us not forget that these ideas are directed not only to governmental cabinets but also to the broad public, and the

public has of course been receiving with understanding the new political thinking that is being firmly established in the foreign-policy practice of our state.

[Pasko] In speaking today about our party conference, restructuring and what is now being done in the sphere of international relations, one cannot fail, of course, to mention Afghanistan.

[Chukseyev] Our position with regard to regional conflicts is clear. We are demonstrating it by a constructive approach to resolving the difficult and complex issue of an Afghan settlement. It will probably be interesting to see what the West's position is in this sphere at the present time.

The latest representative forum at which there was a broad discussion of regional conflicts was the economic summit meeting of seven leading Western countries in Toronto that took place from 19 to 21 June. Although it is called an economic meeting, it normally also considers the main political and international issues that concern the world. Well then, when this meeting was examining regional conflicts, those taking part began their analysis with the situation concerning Afghanistan. In the Political Declaration that they issued they welcomed the continuing withdrawal of Soviet troops, but all the indications are that the West regards this as the only condition for solving the Afghan problem. In this connection they are conveniently forgetting the whole complex of the Geneva agreements. It is only by the observance of these by all sides that the attainment of this goal can be ensured.

Indeed the appeal there in Toronto to the Soviet Union to make a constructive contribution to the solution of other regional conflicts too—which was contained in the Political Declaration—sounded inappropriate. Inappropriate, because in their review of the situation in hotspots such as the Near East and southern Africa they themselves in no way displayed a new bold approach and new political thinking. For example, while verbally expressing regret over events in the occupied Arab lands, the leaders of the Seven preferred to support the U.S. draft settlement—the so-called Shultz Plan—which is plainly not working well. Fervent with moral indignation they condemned the apartheid regime. However they categorically declined to have recourse to resolute measures in order to curb the high-handed actions of the white minority dictatorship in the RSA. The question of sanctions against the RSA was raised. Once again the host country, Canada, tried unsuccessfully to pose it, but the majority were against resolute measures. So in my view it is precisely from the Western countries that a constructive contribution is required to solve these and other regional conflicts, including Central America, of course.

[Shishlin] A certain amount, of course, depends on us. We are ready to make our contribution to a solution of regional conflicts, guided by the consideration that it is the sacred right of each people to choose its own path of development. Incidentally the Soviet Union has been energetically supporting not only a political settlement in Afghanistan but also a political settlement in Cambodia. Our proposals on the Near East, southern Africa and Central America are well known. As to Afghanistan, I would like to draw the attention of our listeners to the fact that there are two countries which are sacredly fulfilling the Geneva agreements: the Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. Soviet troops are being withdrawn from that country precisely according to schedule. And barring any complications, by the 15 August there will be Soviet troops in only 8 Afghan provinces out of 30. That is the first thing.

Secondly, I would like to say that in the West, you know, the idea—an absolutely contrived idea—is constantly creeping in that the regime is allegedly shaky in Kabul and that it is about to fall and that the situation generally is a foregone conclusion: Everything has been calculated ahead. The armed opposition stated in particular that Jalalabad would fall on 1 June. Yet we are now talking in July, and Jalalabad is in the hands of the Republic and the Republic is generally proving that, while it is indeed facing a complex situation—one must not simplify anything—it has sufficient resources and opportunities, political and military opportunities, at its disposal to protect the sovereignty of Afghanistan.

I think therefore that regional conflicts in themselves look rather different in the middle of 1988 from the way they looked at the same time in the middle of 1987. Yes, they are just as dramatic and dangerous, and threaten just as much to develop into something bigger, transcending the bounds of the regions. Even today they complicate international relations. A little bit of a thawing process is nevertheless taking place. Political dialogues are beginning. Policies of national reconciliation are taking shape in a number of zones. I think therefore that here too all shades as it were should be considered.

[Pasko] It seems to me that it would be unfair today not to mention the opportunities that the new political thinking has opened up for the development of international economic cooperation. A graphic example of this is that the EEC and CEMA have officially recognized each other. It is even strange to speak today of the two major intergovernmental economic organizations whose members account for 55 percent of trade between East and West not having had relations with one another. Talks about this have been held over 15 years. This cooperation has still, of course, many enemies. Suffice it to recall the recent warning of U.S. Defense Secretary Carlucci, that to trade with the Soviet Union is to strengthen a potential enemy. Such warnings are pouring in a continuous stream from those who oppose any improvement in relations with the Soviet Union and in East-West relations. But without underestimating the importance of trade and economic cooperation and cooperation in science and technology with the West, I want to note that its role in the development of Soviet

potential is still nevertheless insignificant and this fact has been noted by Foreign Minister Genscher many times. We can tackle our affairs relying on our own potential. Cooperation with the West is of importance above all in political terms. For it strengthens trust between countries.

[Shishlin] Let us put the question in this way: Do Western and Eastern Europe have interests in common? Of course they do. Of course they do—not only in trade, economic cooperation, or security. I think that what is in the common interest of all of Europe and every European state is unobstructed development of economic cooperation, such as will promote the division of labor among the European countries, their coproduction and specialization. The future of Europe must in the long run be determined by the people of Europe themselves. I do not doubt that the coming years will of course bring substantial increases in reciprocal relations between the countries of Eastern and Western Europe, but only on the indispensable condition that we ourselves get a move on: on the indispencable condition that the ideas, thoughts and considerations expressed within the framework of the party conference and the ideas laid down in the radical economic reforms are implemented without interruptions and delays. Indeed, look for yourselves. I will not quote the speeches of the conference delegates. Everyone has heard and read them. But the fact that the talks between the EEC and CEMA have been continuing for 15 years was also incidentally connected in many respects, with a rather conservative position on the part of East European states.

[Chukseyev] I agree that one ought to see all the shades and nuances of the picture. I also hold an optimistic view of the development of trade in the coming years. In this we are prompted by practical experience and the entire progress of the development of international relations.

Verbally at least, the West has admittedly been stating ever more frequently its readiness to develop these relations in this way. Well, let us say... [changes thought] I would like to come back again to the economic summit in Toronto. In what way was this matter raised there? The political declaration adopted there said that economic relations between East and West maybe broadened and may serve our common interests if they are based on a solid commercial foundation and on the principles and rules of international trade. Well, all seems well. There is however another but, or to be more precise, another if, which is this: If these relations do not contradict the interests of our countries, that is the countries of the Group of Seven. Then at the briefings in Toronto, representatives of the national delegations deciphered the meaning of these conditions. What became clear is that the situation briefly amounts to the fact that the inequitable basis of present trade relations remains in force, unfortunately. Rozanne Ridgeway, assistant secretary to the U.S. secretary of state, spoke very specifically in this respect. She stated that the United States does not intend to abandon the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act adopted in 1974. As everyone knows, this amendment blocks the Soviet Union from receiving most favored nation status in trade. Judge for yourselves how paradoxical this amendment is now. Charles Vanik, a former member of the House of Representatives of the Congress, retired from political life as long ago as 1981. Senator Henry Jackson died in 1983, of a heart attack. Since this amendmend was passed 14 years have elapsed. The world has changed considerably. Soviet-U.S. relations have also undergone considerable changes. The United States, however, continues living in the past in this respect, retaining discrimination, and its side-effects are being felt by U.S. business itself.

[Pasko] On the day the party conference opened, UPI wrote this: This conference will become one of the most important tests of how much support there is for Gorbachev's bold program reforms. The whole world can observe today that our party's policy of restructuring enjoys the powerful support of our people. We do not intend to abandon restructuring. It is developing both in breadth and in depth. This means that the policyline aimed at rendering our struggle for peace and cooperation more effective will be continued. For, as everyone knows, foreign policy is an extension of domestic policy. With this, let me bid you goodbye Comrades and thank you all for taking part in the program and you, esteemed listeners, for your attention. All the best.

'Top Priority' Program Views Conference

LD0207151088 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 1 Jul 88

["Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov of Moscow's United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. The 19th Communist Party Conference, the first in 47 years, that has just ended in Moscow has laid the groundwork for a radical, a complete overhaul, of the Soviet political system. I understand that in one program, it goes without saying, that in one program we won't be able to cover all the aspects of the reform.

[Bogdanov] Maybe, maybe, Pavel, in two programs.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, perhaps in two programs we won't be able, so we'll go on discussing and evaluating the outcome of the conference in many programs to come. But I would like in this particular one to assess, just in the, in the wake of the conference, to assess its immediate results, and in the first place, why is this radical overhaul of the political system needed at all in the Soviet Union? Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogadnov] I'm very much, I'm very much impressed by the fact that at last, at last we have a clear picture of the priorities. You remember, Pavel, a number of times before the conference we were just trying to depict the main problems of the conference we'll be taking up, but this time the conference is already there, it's the fact. So, now you could put the question, how our predictions, if you like, about the conference went through, and were we right in our assessment or not. I believe that we were right. We were right but to some extent. I, frankly, I didn't expect that the conference will make such sharp points of priorities in our political life. I see two priorities.

Number one is changing the, radical changing of the economical systems. I emphasize radical changes. On the other hand, a radical reforming of the political system; and there is a very close link between both, and if you like, there's a kind of a vicious circle. What I mean by that—if you don't change radically the economical system you will not be able to change the political system. If you don't change the political system you will not be able to change the economical system.

[Kuznetsov] And by these changes?

[Bogdanov] And by these changes, and by these changes, and I believe that the design, the grand design is to make both unilaterally. I mean to start....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Simultaneously.

[Bogdanov] I'm sorry, simultaneously. I mean to start changing economical system and at the same time start drastic changes in the political, political....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] What is at the core of these political changes that we seek to....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] You know, I believe, Sergey will talk about that, but very briefly I believe that the party takes a very very clear-cut decision that she should get busy with party work and to leave to the other bodies of the state, including the government, its due. Party is a political avant-garde. It's a political, spiritual if you like, it's a spiritual force which do not, which does not interfere directly into government, into agriculture, into some other activities. It makes them to work spiritually but doesn't interfere. That's, I believe, that's the main idea.

[Kuznetsov] Okay. Thank you, Dr Bogdanov. My next question to you, Dr Plekhanov, I've already put my question: What is at the core of the political reform that we are seeking to achieve?

[Plekanov] Well, at the core is the question of power, how power is organized, who effectively controls the various levels of government policymaking. And the problem that we have with the current political system is that power is extremely centralized and concentrated. As a result, you have a very big complex, multi-ethnic, very educated society which the existing political system is trying to micromanage from the center. As a result, you have a government which is inefficient because you simply cannot possibly control such a complex system from the center. If you try to do that, you find that you are virtually powerless and nobody is in control. So the idea of democratization of the political system is to spread power around. This is what the 1917 revolution was fought for—power to the people—and there are a whole lot of institutions in our society which can and must be empowered, and at the center of them are the soviets, the councils of people's deputies....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] People's deputies, right.

[Plekhanov] ...which are to be effectively empowered. They are to become....

[Bogadnov, interrupting] Sergey, I'm sorry. If, if we keep in mind our American listeners....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yeah.

[Bogdanov] ...what is the equivalent. I understand it....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Council.

[Kuznetsov] And I understand that they are, and they will have to be elected, those councils, from a multicandidacy.

[Plekhanov] Oh, yes, certainly.

[Kuznetsov] With a lot of competition for those seats out in the open, not just....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yeah but, but before we get into that, this idea of spreading power around means many things. It means that the executive will have less power and the legislative bodies will have more power. It means that the party will have less power in terms of managing the affairs of society and give more power to the legislature. It means that the center will have more power but the periphery will have, the center will have less power and the periphery have more. It means that the electorate will have a power to choose between various candidates rather than simply ratify the decisions which have already been made. It means that the press will have more power vis-a-vis the governmental bodies. So you see this idea of spreading power around in the society to provide a more rational and healthy system of government, a truly democratic system of government.

[Kuznetsov] And now let me very briefly give our listeners an idea of a major political change that we here seek and it's the creation of a new legislative body called the Congress of People's Deputies, composed of 1,500 delegates elected in districts nationwide, plus another 750 seats allotted to Communist Party committees, trade unions, artistic organizations, and others. The congress

would meet once a year, and in between its meetings there will be a standing legislature of from 400 to 450 members with a president at the top, and the president would have very broad powers. So, the natural result that we are seeking, in my view, is that we are going to have very effective decisionmaking bodies, not rubber-stamp legislatures that we used to have, plus the president, who would have the mandate from both the people and the party. Currently, our parliament is a rather nominal legislature with all major decisions being taken in the top echelons of the party, where many proposals to speed up the pace of reform seem to be whittled down. I would like to back up what you said, Dr Bogdanov, when you emphatically demonstrated that economic reforms and political changes go hand in hand, go together. But by urging more independence for state enterprises, we kind of invite them to compete against each other. We are inviting a certain degree of competition....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Pavel. Yeah.

[Kuznetsov] ...and at the same time we urge the party to stop meddling in the day-to-day management activities of this kind, economic activities. But, by inviting more competition in the economic area, in the economic field, we are inviting a good deal of competition, even if we do not recognize, or do not say about it, we are bound to invite a lot of competition in the political area as well. Don't you agree with that?

[Bogdanov] Well, I do agree with you.

[Kuznetsov] But at the same time we continue to frown upon suggestions to create opposition parties to it. How would you explain that?

[Bogdanov] Pavel, I believe this is very healthy process. Party has no monopoly for power. Once party got power it doesn't mean it has it forever. Party has to prove every day, Maybe....

[Plekahnov, interrupting] To win....

[Bogdanov] ...to win....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] ...confidence....

[Bogdanov] ...every day, every minute, to win the confidence of the people, which, whom the party rules. So, if there is a competition, healthy socialist competition based on socialist ppluralism, based on socialist pluralism, so what's wrong? I believe that will give to our society new, new impulses, and very powerful impulses for development. And Pavel, I believe in self-regulation. If you have good developed economy, modern, up to date, based on high tech, it is self-regulating economy. If you have well-organized healthy society built on good human principles, it is a self-regulating society. After all, what is self-rule? Sergey, what is self-rule?

[Plekhanov] Well, government by the people.

[Bogdanov] Government by the people, and that is our aim!

[Plekhanov] That's what the Constitution proclaims [word indistinct].

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes, yes.

[Kuznetsov] You didn't answer the second part of my question, which dealt with certain attempts to frown and to denounce what is described as attempt, attempts to form opposition or competing parties, because this is supposed to go against the principle and the concept of social democracy.

[Plekhanov] Well, I think that it is not written, it is not etched in stone, that socialism means a one-party system. We know socialist countries in which there are several parties.

[Bogdanov] That's what we have; this is historical precedent.

[Plekhanov] By the way, the first government, the first Soviet Government formed in 1917, had two parties, but....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Sergey, I'm afraid, even three parties. Left revolutionaries, Mensheviks, and left revolutionaries were there.

[Plekhanov] All right, but I mean, the fact is, that because of a civil war that started....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Yeah.

[Plekhanov] We became a one-party system. And I'm not sure that at this point there is a necessity to form another party, because if you have a really democratic change of the political system you can stay with one party and have a very very effective way of letting people voice their demands and grievances, let them effectively participate in the affairs of government, because after all, the number of parties is not the key thing. In Lebanon there are, I think, 12 or 13 parties....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Or in Italy....

[Plekhanov] In Italy, yeah, there are six I think, right?

[Bogdanov] Six, yeah, or eight even.

[Plekhanov] And in the United States, two parties. Does it mean that Italy is three times as democratic as the United States?

[Kuznetsov] Right, I thank you, Sergey. I think that the majority of the people here wanted to see, wanted to watch live coverage of the conference but there was no

such live coverage. But, nevertheless, from television and radio news programs and press accounts we know that the atmosphere there at the conference was very lively, spirited.

[Plekhanov] The record, the full texts are printed in the media, that's important.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, in the papers, press accounts of what was there, and in fact I was lucky enough to watch a direct feed from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. The atmosphere was lively; there was a lot of spirited and free-wheeling debate and at times it would have been an understatement even to say the debate was lively. (?It turned), it spilled over into a very acute clash of opinions at times, which, all this does not in my view fit the description of perestroyka as the work of one man as it sometimes presented in the West; like the work of one man, General Secretary Gorbachev, taking on singlehandedly the rest of the party machine and most of the government officials. It means, and from this party conference I have understood, that perestroyka and glasnost have much broader support than I ever imagined. But at the same, in his keynote address, speech, on Tuesday, last Tuesday, Mikhail Gorbachev candidly admitted to the fact that the new policy has not yet reached a stage where it is guaranteed against being turned back. What is the reason, what is this mechanism that could turn or stem the tide of perestroyka?

[Bogdanov] What is the mechanism? It's a very good question. If we knew exactly the people against or mechanism against....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Some names were mentioned during the (?speeches at the conference).

[Bogdanov] Some names, but you know, all that is bunk, all that is bunk, it is not serious. I'm sorry. It's bunk, you know.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, you come from the, you come from USA and Canada studies institute and your boss, Academician Arbatov, was mentioned. He was urged to step down. I understand your feelings, you're kind of upset a bit.

[Bogdanov] I mean, it is not serious at such a gathering just to throw names without too much foundation.

[Kuznetsov] (?Now), that's your opinion, okay.

[Bogdanov] That's my personal opinion, maybe I'm wrong. But that's why, that's why to make perestroyka irreversible you have to break the political, or reform the political system. Because you have such a political system now in which it's inherited, you know, the resistance, the resistance to the innovation. We are not yet a society which are open to innovation. That's our tragedy. We are not able to adjust, to change ourselves, in such a way that we go by step by step with the path of history.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, it's rather painful.

[Bogdanov] So, rather, rather painful. And mind you, that may be for the first time in my very long life, I was present at the creation, if I may say so, of a very new democratic culture, political. I saw quite a number of people, dozens of people, who did not agree with the general secretary.

[Kuznetsov] Talked back in fact.

[Bogdanov] Talked back, talked back, they, they, saying....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] (?They) even challenged him politically.

[Bogdanov] Even challenging, challenging. This is very healthy, this is very democratic. That's what makes all of us optimistic, Sergey.

[Kuznetsov] Dr Bogdanov has just summed up his impressions of the party conference, his immediate impressions, and as time is running out on us I'm afraid, Sergey, what are your feelings about.... [changes thought] I understand that you agree with what Dr Bogdanov has just said. I'm in full agreement with him because for me it was a revelation, it was a discovery of something absolutely, entirely new in our political life. I agree with you 100 percent. What is....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Now this conference is about taking stock of perestroyka. What are the forces, what are the opinions, what is the party all about at this stage of perestroyka, and the sounds, the signals that I am getting from watching the news and reading the reports are very positive. We are on our way, and I'm now more certain than before that there will be no turning back. We will proceed along the road of democratization and we will build a new society, a new socialist society which will be a very attractive and very efficient.

[Bogdanov] Human, very free....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yes.

[Bogdanov] ...and very human, first of all human.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you very much. Gentlemen, our time is up. Thanks for coming and joining me on "Top Priority." And thanks to all our listeners who spent their time with us, and goodbye until next week at the same time and on the same wavelength, and we'll be discussing more of the national Communist Party conference.

Estonian Economist Reviews Conference
LD0307143188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1015 GMT 3 Jul 88

[From the program entitled "Impressions, Reflections, Plans: Meetings With Delegates to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference"; studio interview with Estonian economist Academician Mikhail Lazarevich Bronshteyn by unidentified correspondent]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] Mikhail Lazarevich, I know that the Estonian delegation came to the conference with its own platform, one that had been discussed and accepted by virtually the whole population of the republic. One could say it was an all-republican platform. Could you tell us to what extent the events at the conference coincided with your platform?

[Bronshteyn] Work began on drawing up the republic party organization's platform as far back as Tartu. When the idea of a platform arose people at first asked what was the point, where were we going to take it, the party and the Central Committee will decide everything for you. There was some surprise at the idea, but then it gained increasing support, though there were distortions and attempts to claim that we were envisaging a closed economy and virtually trying to secede from the union.

[Correspondent] I think that came mainly from the West, and if it was then taken up, then only at the level of rumors. In my view it was totally unfounded.

[Bronshteyn] Absolutely. The point is that we also have extremist and nationalist movements. They were exploiting the deformations that occurred in the past and, most importantly, they were exploiting the repressions that took place in Estonia. Things were therefore quite difficult, and a group of Communists decided to fill in all these blank pages, to put forward their views on those events, and to prepare a platform that was both within the framework of restructuring and comprehensible to the people.

[Correspondent] You know, I generally have the feeling that the more open and the more honest we are and the more frankness there is, the less nationalism there is, in whatever republic.

[Bronshteyn] Well, you see, there are reasons behind nationalism. The point is that it is nurtured when we fail to notice these reasons and make no attempt to resolve urgent problems. This is its breeding ground, just as for any kind of extremism. In effect we have cut the ground from beneath the extremists and the nationalist groups by the platform with which the republic's party organization came here. And the most interesting thing is that when the CPSU Central Committee Theses appeared many of the elements in our platform were already there. We heard even more of those elements at the conference itself.

[Correspondent] I find it remarkable that in its main points and main tenets the platform proposed by the Communists coincided 90-95 percent with the all-republican platform.

[Bronshteyn] Ninety...you've put it perfectly. It coincided, which means that we represent not only Estonia's Communists but also the broadest masses. Estonia has never known such activity, such social activity. It hasn't occurred during my lifetime. [passage omitted on description of conference atmosphere]

[Bronshteyn] In the past our concept of republican financial autonomy virtually caused reactions of horror, but before our delegation had even spoken, the same platform had been put forward by Belorussia, Georgia, Komi, and a whole number of others. There are common problems, and these were highlighted very vividly at the conference.

Absolute power has ended up in the hands of the union departments, absolute power. We have an even simpler name for it: Departmental robbery. They often behave like international, multinational corporations: they pillage the environment with no concern for anything, and they take no account of demographic factors or the indigenous population and their traditions. Their task is to fulfill the plan at any cost, to assimilate investment, and in any republic this absolute power of the departments leads to the growth of tension between nationalities. After all, for the average Estonian whose land is being spoiled...[Bronshteyn changes thought] Workers are being brought in. Whereas the Estonian population was in the majority—90 percent—since the war it's now only 60 percent. And if things go on this way they will end up as a minority in their own ancestral land. All this is being decided somewhere in Moscow by some abstract Ivan Ivanovich. This Ivan Ivanovich is maybe not in the least chauvinistic; no, he's for friendship among the peoples, but he doesn't know the problems or anything else. He just solves his limited task.

This has given rise to the idea of territorial financial autonomy. Historically it is very advantageous to us to have the union, the union market. This has taken shape historically. It is advantageous for us to sell livestock produce and buy grain and fuel. Of course, it is also important for us to open up the Western market and technology and sell not our raw materials but brains in modern centers. Each region must raise its competitiveness, and economic support can be given to achieve this, using tax benefits, subsidies. Everyone does this, the Japanese, Americans, the FRG, everyone.

There has to be a mechanism for protecting the environment at union and republican levels. Who is going to protect it? These departments? Here you've got Soviet power and here's its territory. If there's any threat of an ecological disaster then it's taboo, banned. All these

departments are criticized for destroying the economy and the ecology, but unfortunately they are also destroying the union of Soviet republics. Centrifugal tendencies would reinforce it.

Professor Advocates Rotation of Leaders

LD0307132088 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 2 Jul 88

[Text] The struggle over the policy of perestroyka and openness will intensify during the implementation of the reform in the country's political system, suggested by the 19th Communist Party conference. The old bureaucratic machinery built under Stalin will strongly oppose all reforms, said Professor Nikolay Maslov of the Social Sciences Academy working under the Communist Party Central Committee. However, this struggle will not necessarily take the form of open clashes, Professor Maslov said.

This will involve covert resistance to perestroyka and methods to sabotage the fundamental economic reform. For instance, ministries will give their plants government orders to take up 100 percent of their production capacity, instead of granting the plants the right of option and economic independence. Central planning bodies will interpret economic legislation at will, and their instructions will bind the initiative of plants and factories.

The main goal of the proposed political reform is to limit the authority of party executives and transfer many of their functions to the soviets, central and local government bodies established as a result of general elections, Professor Nikolay Maslov said.

While supporting the idea to combine the posts of the Communist Party general secretary and that of the country's president, Professor Maslov insists that the tenure of all government and party officers must be limited to two 5-year terms. In debates on the eve of the party conference and during it some speakers suggested the possibility of allowing a third term in office in exceptional cases. Well known actor and public figure Mikhail Ulyanov for example said that he would apply the reservation regarding the third term only to Mikhail Gorbachev. And the historian Professor Nikolay Maslov disagrees: No concessions should be made. If the reservation about the possibility of a third term in office is made, why not allow a fourth term? We must not orient the entire system to one man, even if he is the best. What we need is a democratic mechanism that would provide for a rotation of leaders.

Professor Maslov also believes that it's essential to democratize the party and society in the course of the proposed political reform. We must provide for the possibility of giving up one's party's membership freely and voluntarily, which has never been practiced before, and end all privileges for party members, particularly as regards job promotion. A person who is not a member of the Communist Party cannot serve as a party leader of course, but he or she can very well serve as an economic leader, and his not belonging to the Communist Party must not hinder his or her career. Any Soviet citizen must have the right to take any government office in real terms.

Conference Minutes To Be Published

LD0307125288 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 3 Jul 88

[Text] The minutes of the 19th Conference of the Soviet Communist Party will be published in about two volumes. The edition, according to a spokesman of the Central Committee's publishing house, will include both the statements made by the delegates at the conference and the statements prepared yet not delivered because of a shortage of time. The account will be published in 200,000 copies, yet it may be increased depending on demand.